THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVII NOVEMBER, 1938 No. 221

EDITORIAL

It was impossible a month ago to write about contemporary world-events because they were moving so fast. Since then has come a pause, and during the first weeks of the pause many wise things and some things not so wise have been said in print. Theology does not as a rule handle political subjects, but, if it does, it attempts to handle them in such a way that readers could not on purely Christian grounds deny the truth of what is said. Let us attempt to take up our own challenge of a month ago. We quoted Lincoln's words: "With charity towards all, with malice towards none." This, we said, is always true.

If it is still true, how can it be practised? Bishop Gore used to say in another connection that those to whom either the more ecclesiastical or the more personal and individualist parts of the New Testament were specially congenial ought as a matter of duty to give themselves to the study of the other parts. Thus their theology would have balance. It would derive from the whole mind of the New Testament. The application is this: there are clearly some who find it difficult to practise charity towards Germany, and some who cannot easily practise it towards Russia. But real charity never faileth.

The moral weakness which seems to threaten the two main groups into which our people are divided is that among the motives of both there may lurk hostility. It is not suggested that there is no one who is free from this, or that there are any whose sole motive it is. But there is in some of the partisans of one view hostility to Russia, and on the other side there is some hostility to Germany. This seems to mar the perfection of the love of peace which is professed on one side,

and the sympathy for the Czechoslovak Republic professed on the other. Can we not have charity towards all, and malice towards none ?

Charity does not entail approval. That would be to abandon the moral judgment. The most charitable thing ever said, " Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," contains no approval for the deed. It is true that " Judge not " is a word of the Lord. Of this it has been said that: " Among any average company of men and women today, in the railway carriage, or workshop, or race-meeting, no precept of the New Testament would secure such whole-hearted acceptance." Nevertheless, it is followed a few lines later by " Beware of false prophets." Now, such prophets must be judged before they can be known to be false. It is surely one of the most urgent and most difficult Christian duties at this moment to exercise a right judgment upon the prophets of the age. Suppose it to be agreed that the Christian ideal for society is ordered liberty, with each personality free to develop and at the same time conscious that development is only possible in company with the others. What then ? Do the public spirit and the buoyant hopefulness of the Nazis outweigh the evil of the appeal to force and fear from which they do not shrink ? Is it the rudeness of the adolescent (we say " adolescent " because the new Germany, whether it be dated from 1918 or 1933, is very young), or is it a permanent vice in the national ethos, never to be healed, a sin against the Holy Ghost ? Is Russia, having emerged from one tyranny, and having, as it would seem, submitted to another, nevertheless really moving towards a condition in which Russians will be free ? How much truth is there in the contention of some that the Russians are already, without meaning it, and without knowing it, more Christian than we are, and that we should therefore look respectfully to see what they are doing ? What precise amount of confidence can be felt that Statesman X or Statesman Y means what he says and will keep his promises ? To what extent is our own would-be Christian judgment of prophesyings in Europe affected by a tradition which is not particularly Christian and simply happens to be our own familiar political tradition ? When we talk of our love of peace, do we simply mean our wish for the preservation of a *status quo* which happens to give us a great deal ? Is it after all only the language of the retired burglar ? An old clergyman, the gentlest of creatures, who would not willingly hurt anyone and was in private life most self-effacing and uncovetous, said in 1918: " Mesopotamia ? Oh, of course *we*

must have that, because of the oil." Dr. Oldham's letter to *The Times* on October 5, 1938, suggests, without attempting to describe, the immensity of the revolution which must take place before our judgments and our actions become those of a Christian nation.

If " with charity towards all " points in the true direction, then our national policy must have a universal outlook and must fail in goodwill nowhere. The method of attempting to sow dissension among potential enemies is bad. The method of creating a strong and well-armed *bloc* antagonistic to another *bloc* is bad. It is bad, whichever of two possible *blocs* it chooses to adhere to. The only real collective security is one that is truly collective and has enlisted the goodwill of everyone. This may be a long way off. It may have to be reached piecemeal. We may first have to overcome the prejudices of, say, Holland, and then swallow our dislike of the internal political methods of Peru, and then discuss the peaceful settlement of difficult and delicate outstanding questions with Siam. It is, of course, notorious that " Holland " and " Peru " and " Siam " could not be brought into a friendly conference at the moment. But just as in the movement towards Church unity there is no harm in gradual and partial methods, so long as they make more possible the ultimate victory of peace, so in political contacts it may be truly wise to mend rents one at a time.

Yet the vision is universal. Some are in method wholly pacifist, others consent to have national armaments. But for all Christians the vision is the same, the vision of a holy mountain, in which they shall not hurt nor destroy. Scott Holland wrote in October, 1914, when Britain was at war:

> " Just so far as we fight for no other necessity or motive whatever, but the honour of the Peace in which God wills all men to live with one another; just so far as we seek nothing but peace as the one imperative conclusion of the whole matter; just so far as we carry into our warfare, and retain under its strain, the temper that is created in peace, and allow no war-passion to becloud our conscience or brutalize our instinct; just so far as we still love those we are fighting, and desire nothing more than to be reconciled and at peace with them, in the blessed bonds of human brotherhood; just so far as we believe man's life to be made for peace, and not war; to be intelligible only in peace; to be miserable until it find

peace; to be so created that peace, in the common fellowship, is its very food, its breath, its nature, its hope, its joy. This is the truth that holds the earth together, and hangs the heaven over our heads. The Lamb is on the Throne. We can hold to that, in the thick of the horror and the shame; and nurse in our souls, even as we fight, the secret of His Peace."

That was in October, 1914, when we were all thinking in terms of Belgium and our promise. We know now that there were other reasons for the War. But those were Christian words, written in the actual days of war.

Malice is hard to root out. Mr. Huxley's bitter words in *Ends and Means*, a book which everyone should read, must be laid to heart:

> " The personified nation, as I have pointed out already, is divine in size, strength, and mystical superiority, but sub-human in moral character. The ethics of international politics are precisely those of the gangster, the pirate, the swindler, the bad bold baron. The exemplary citizen can indulge in vicarious criminality, not only on the films, but also in the field of international relations. The divine nation of whom he is mystically a part bullies and cheats, blusters and threatens in a way which many people find profoundly satisfying to their sedulously repressed lower natures. Submissive to the wife, kind to the children, courteous to the neighbours, the soul of honesty in business, the good citizen feels a thrill of delight when his country ' takes a strong line,' ' enhances its prestige,' ' scores a diplomatic victory,' ' increases its territory '—in other words, when it bluffs, bullies, swindles, and steals. The nation is a strange deity. It imposes difficult duties and demands the greatest sacrifices and, because it does this and because human beings have a hunger and thirst after righteousness, it is loved. But it is also loved because it panders to the lowest elements in human nature, and because men and women like to have excuses to feel pride and hatred, because they long to taste even at second hand the joys of criminality."

We can help to root out malice if we can learn to use our Christian judgment in a way that Mr. Huxley recommends elsewhere in his book: " The building-up in individual minds of intellectual and emotional resistance to suggestion."

PRIMITIVE CONSECRATION PRAYERS

I

Dr. Frere's last book on *The Anaphora* will probably mark a watershed in liturgical study. It is as far from the purpose of this article to attack it polemically as it is to quarrel with Fr. Hebert's wise and penetrating review of it in the August Theology. As that review stands it should be easy to defend Fr. Hebert's main thesis point by point. But in the last letter from his hand which I had from Dr. Frere (*clarum nomen et mihi praedilectum*) in answer to a screed from me about certain far-reaching questions which his gift of *The Anaphora* had stirred again in my own mind, he sought a promise that I would raise them publicly—going on, debonair as ever, to parody the Elizabethan lyric, " Strike, love, and spare not !" Fr. Hebert having said certain things which had to be said about that book with a gentleness for which I, for one, am grateful, I am free to write as *pietas* directs, and in no sense by way of " reply " to either of these friends and teachers.

It seems an opportunity to raise—tentatively and without dogmatic assertion of solutions—certain fundamental questions about the early history and contents of what the early Church called " *The* Prayer," *par excellence*—ἡ Εὐχή, *Prex*, Canon, Anaphora, Consecration Prayer, call it what you will—which seem to lie behind Dr. Frere's book and most contemporary study of the question (including, if I am not mistaken, Fr. Hebert's review). These questions will have to be faced sooner or later, in any case, if technical liturgical study is to progress beyond its present very unsatisfactory stage of confused guessing in all that concerns the period of liturgical origins. This is not for us the academic matter it may sound. As Fr. Hebert says, " Before we can hope for a satisfactory revision (of the Prayer Book Liturgy) there will be need of a deeper understanding on the part of clergy and people of what it is that we do in the Eucharistic action." And such a " satisfactory revision " would seem, to one detached observer at least, to be among the indispensable conditions for that renewal of the whole life of the Church as the Body of Christ, which is the only adequate object of the Liturgical Movement, among us Anglicans as elsewhere. So I know that it seemed to Bishop Frere himself, who often spoke to me of the rite of 1662 as, in so many words, " unusable " and " positively misleading "

as to the nature of the Eucharist. Though one had the temerity to disagree with him both as to the merits of "1662" (which are not unimportant) and the alleged virtues of "1928," his desired substitute (of which it is unnecessary to speak here), revision is certainly coming, one hopes not too quickly or as a move in ecclesiastical politics, and is desirable. But is liturgical science amongst us at the moment in a position to supply—or now working quite on the right historical lines to be able to supply—such a "deeper understanding" of the authentic liturgical tradition of the eucharistic action in all its fulness to the clergy and people?

Briefly the position is this: Consciously or unconsciously, Dr. Frere's book rests on two major *assumptions* about the pre-Nicene eucharist. (1) That there was a single universal primitive type or fixed outline of the eucharistic prayer (making all due allowance for isolated abnormalities and for free composition of phrasing by celebrants). (2) That what later appears as the Byzantine outline of that prayer*—Preface, Sanctus, Thanksgiving for Incarnation and Atonement, Institution, Anamnesis, Epiclesis, Prayer for communicants (expanding into Intercessions), Doxology—still represents this single primitive type in its perfected form.

Of the first assumption it may be said that it is still the commonly received opinion, even though the early abnormalities now receive more attention than formerly, and the whole theory of a single primitive type of eucharistic rite was vigorously challenged by H. Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl* (Bonn, 1926), which argues for an original and fundamental duality of types. Lietzmann's arbitrary handling of the primitive evidence is open to decisive objections, and I know that Dr. Frere wholly rejected any such theory of a plurality of liturgical origins, so that Lietzmann's name and book are not so much as mentioned in *The Anaphora*. On the whole this is probably typical of the most recent trend of expert opinion. After a period of hesitation, the assumption of a single original eucharistic type persists strongly.

The second assumption, that the Byzantine structure of the Anaphora still represents this original type, is the classic theory of the liturgiological schools. It was held by all the great liturgists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, from whose splendid tradition Frere himself drew so much inspiration. It is still dominant in Anglican studies, and at least preponderant, if I am not mistaken, among Continental scholars. It is true

* It first certainly appears in its full form in the so-called *Clementine Liturgy* of *Apostolic Constitutions*, Bk. viii., from Antioch c. A.D. 375. But it is uncertain how far this rite is representative of the ordinary Syrian rites at this time, since it is in itself a merely literary compilation never actually used in church.

it has received some slight shocks of recent years. It is, *e.g.*, increasingly obvious that the Sanctus, and that reference to the angelic worship which serves to introduce it, are not an original part of the scheme; while the defence of the universal primitive consecratory Epiclesis, so dear to the seventeenth century, begins to look like a lost battle. Dr. Frere rather skirted these two pieces of thin ice. But without taking up any indefensibly reactionary positions on these points, he set out to rehabilitate and defend on a modern basis the traditional theory that the Byzantine outline still represents the original norm which every eucharistic prayer ought to follow, and of which all other outlines are later elaborations or declensions, not to say corruptions. Bating the questions of the Sanctus and Epiclesis, Fr. Hebert and most other scholars would seem prepared to accept this thesis, which Dr. Frere has restated with a brilliance that will not be surpassed.

The main question I wish to raise is this: Does the early evidence really support this double assumption? Or, put another way: Is this theory of a single primitive type of anaphora, now represented essentially by the Byzantine outline, *exhaustive* of primitive practice and our only guide to the primitive understanding of the Eucharist, so that we Anglicans can now make it the only model of our own future practice and teaching?

At first sight the arguments for such a theory are impressively strong. Every known Eastern rite, taken as it stands, can be fitted into this scheme without too much difficulty, with the one exception of the Egyptian liturgy of St. Serapion (*c.* A.D. 340). But that might be explained away as an eccentric personal compilation. In the West, so far as a thought-out scheme governs the kaleidoscopic variety of the "Gallican" prayers, they are based upon this one. The one Western exception is the Roman Canon, which coincides with the Byzantine scheme only at certain points. Yet this Canon is itself not very coherent, and is universally acknowledged to have undergone an unascertained amount of "dislocation," and at least one major interpolation in the shape of the *Memento* of the dead and the *Nobis quoque* which follows.

Furthermore, the traditional theory can now claim wholly unexpected support from the origins of the Roman rite itself. The Anaphora of St. Hippolytus, which comes from Rome *c.* 215 A.D., lacks the Sanctus (and, as I believe, the Epiclesis), but otherwise corresponds closely with the Byzantine outline of the Anaphora. Some of the phrasing of Hippolytus' prayer certainly represents his own personal theology of the Trinity, but there is no ground for thinking that its structure or *eucharistic* teaching would have been thought abnormal at Rome in

his day. There is some evidence, too, that some such prayer was known to St. Irenæus in Gaul *c.* A.D. 190, and it has solid points of contact with statements about the eucharistic prayer made by St. Justin Martyr at Rome *c.* A.D. 155, so that this tradition reaches back to quite early times, in any case. We may even go further. Hippolytus' Anaphora seems to derive from the Jewish *barakah*-form, which in a predominantly Gentile Church points back to the apostolic or sub-apostolic age as the period of its introduction. Especially as reinforced by the evidence of Hippolytus, the case for the theory of the single primitive type now represented by the Byzantine outline seems really strong.

Nevertheless, admitting all this, there is here no proof that this scheme of the Anaphora, primitive as it undoubtedly was, was also primitively universal. There is a real danger, arising out of the value and importance of Hippolytus' prayer as the only pre-Nicene *text* of an anaphora extant, of doing violence to all the other early evidence by interpreting it in the light of this unique text. If the basic assumption that this was the only type of eucharistic prayer in use in the pre-Nicene Church be mistaken, this can only lead to a serious misunderstanding of the early history of the liturgy, and the impoverishment of the doctrine of the Eucharist. Dr. Frere's book does not avoid this danger, which seems to threaten the integrity of all Anglican liturgical study just now.*

Yet it is a danger difficult to guard against, by reason of the poverty of our other resources. Apart from the third-century Roman rite in Hippolytus, the only liturgical *texts* which have come down to us from before A.D. 350 are—(1) the *Liturgy of St. Sarapion* from Egypt, *c.* A.D. 340, and (2) from Syria: (*a*) the liturgical passages which can be extracted from the *Catecheses* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 348); (*b*) the older portions of the *Liturgy of Addai and Mari*,† from Edessa, which certainly go back to the early fourth century, and probably at least to the third. We can thus document three different traditions to some extent—the Roman in the third century, the Egyptian and the Syrian in the fourth. Apart from these sources, our early liturgical evidence is drawn from liturgical allusions and reminiscences in early Christian writers. Where we have

* In writing this I am unhappily aware of certain sentences in my edition of the *Apostolic Tradition*; *e.g.*, Hippolytus "is the first writer to present us with the complete type of the universal primitive rite of Christendom" (p. xli). That was written in 1934. I could not now be so positive, and have in fact come to suppose that "universal" is wrong, even though I still believe that Hippolytus' rite adequately represents *a* primitive type, found at Rome in his day.

† These were reconstructed in a brilliant study by Mr. E. C. Ratcliff (*J.T.S.*, xxx., 1928, p. 23 *seq.*). Whatever reservations one may make as to details, this is one of those rare pieces of work by which solid knowledge of primitive rites has been advanced.

no contemporary liturgical texts with which to compare this scattered literary evidence, it is often hard to discern such material accurately or certainly in the course of patristic arguments on non-liturgical subjects, and often still harder to be sure of its exact bearing when it has been discovered.

Beside the relatively solid ground afforded by Hippolytus, arguments from such materials must necessarily appear tentative. Yet I believe they can be made to bear enough weight to act as a check on our assumptions, if the whole material available be employed scientifically. Since I cannot here embark on the reconstruction of the whole early anaphoral traditions of Syria and Egypt, it will be necessary to deal with this aspect of the question by illustrations. The universality in primitive rites of either the Words of Institution or the Epiclesis are questions so enveloped in the dust of irrelevant later controversies that it seems wiser to take other items in the Hippolytan-Byzantine scheme for the purpose. I shall, therefore, here concentrate chiefly on the Anamnesis, and on the Preface leading up to the Sanctus, in the early Egyptian and Syrian rites. How do they compare with Hippolytus ?

II

The Anamnesis

This section of Hippolytus' prayer runs thus: " . . . When ye do this ye do [*or* do ye] My anamnesis. Doing therefore the anamnesis of His death and resurrection, we offer to Thee the bread and the cup, making eucharist to Thee because Thou hast bidden us [*or* made us worthy] to stand before Thee and minister as priests to Thee."

For both Dr. Frere and Fr. Hebert this is the pivot of the whole eucharistic action, not only in Hippolytus but in the Christian Eucharist as such. As I believe I am originally responsible for that interpretation of ἀνάμνησις, word and prayer, which they both adopt, I hasten to add that I believe it correct, so far as Hippolytus' rite and its derivatives are concerned. But how does the matter stand with other rites ?

1. Egypt.—(*a*) *Sarapion* has no Anamnesis at all. It passes straight from the Institution of the Chalice to its Epiclesis of the Word, without so much as including the scriptural " Do this εἰς ἀνάμνησιν of Me." Is this an abnormal peculiarity, or is it the regular Egyptian tradition ?

There are two later documents by which we can test this. The first is the *Liturgy of St. Mark*, the mediæval descendant of the old patriarchal liturgy of Alexandria. The second is a papyrus fragment of a liturgy from Dêr Balyzeh.

(*b*) *St. Mark* in the earliest extant MSS. (twelfth century) has a clear and normal Anamnesis of the Hippolytan type in the normal place, after the Institution. But it is borrowed as to more than 70 per cent. of its wording verbally from the Anamnesis in the present text of the Jerusalem *Liturgy of St. James*. It is now recognized on all hands that "whilst our present text of *St. Mark* contains buried in it most precious and ancient remains of the early Egyptian and Alexandrine Liturgy, this primitive element has been also largely overlaid by foreign elements, chiefly Hierosolymitan, either adopted almost verbally or worked up in a literary manner."* Since this decisive judgment was formulated the chance discovery of a fourth or fifth century papyrus fragment† of the unrevised text of *St. Mark* (which unfortunately does not extend to the Anamnesis) enables us by comparison with the present text to demonstrate the methods of the reviser. He has respected the old Alexandrian wording where it provided something parallel to *St. James*, though often farcing it with elaborations. Whole clauses are taken over bodily from *St. James* only where there was no equivalent in *St. Mark*. The inference as to the Anamnesis in *St. Mark* as it now stands is, therefore, that there was nothing corresponding to the Anamnesis of the Hippolytan-Byzantine outline in the old Alexandrian tradition; which, in this at least, resembled what we find in *Sarapion*.

(*c*) The Dêr Balyzeh fragments were written in the seventh or eighth century, though the liturgy of which they contained a copy might well be a century or two older in composition.‡ This rite also ends its Institution without the words "Do this," etc., but instead has this curious substitute for an Anamnesis: "As often as ever ye do eat this bread and drink this cup ye shew forth My death, ye confess My resurrection. Thy death we shew forth, Thy resurrection we confess, and we pray . . ." (here the fragment ends). This remarkable weaving of 1 Cor. xi. 26 into the text of the Institution is again a verbal borrowing from the Institution narrative of *St. James*. The direct address to the Son which does substitute for an Anamnesis in the D.B. rite is also from *St. James*, where it forms the *Congregation's Response*, immediately following on the Words of Institution (*cf.* LEW, p. 52). The D.B. rite, notwithstanding certain obvious "Syrianisms," is a representative of the Egyptian tradition in most important points.

* Edmund Bishop, *J.T.S.*, x., p. 602.

† *P. Strasb.* 254 Publ. Andrieu and Collomp, *Rev. des Sciences Religieuses*, 1928, iv.

‡ The best edition of the text is that in *Liturgiæ, Preces, Hymni Christianorum e Papyris Collecti*, C. del Grande, Naples, 1934. (2nd edition—a great improvement on the 1st).

Yet in order to find an Anamnesis it has been forced to insert an obvious foreign borrowing.

So far as the extant evidence takes us, then, there is no support for the assumption that there existed in Egypt an indigenous tradition of an Anamnesis of the Hippolytan type in the Hippolytan position. It is altogether missing from the oldest known Egyptian rite. When it does appear it is frankly an importation from the *Liturgy of St. James.*

But was such an Anamnesis original in *St. James* itself, as anciently used at Jerusalem ?

2. Syria.—(*a*) In Easter Week, A.D. 348, St. Cyril of Jerusalem explained the Eucharist to the Catechumens who had just attended it for the first time, in a series of lectures which have been preserved. In the nature of the case he is obliged to cite frequently and verbally from the Anaphora then in use at Jerusalem. Accordingly, we find him beginning by commenting on the text of the Preface and Sanctus, in such a way that we can detect in his rite the presence of nearly every clause in the present Preface of *St. James.* Having dealt with this, he continues: "Then (εἶτα), after hallowing ourselves with these spiritual hymns (*i.e.*, the Sanctus) we call upon God, the lover of men, to send forth the Holy Ghost . . .", and so he proceeds straight away to expound the Epiclesis, again in a form almost verbally identical with the text of the present Epiclesis of *St. James.* Dr. Frere assumed that St. Cyril "passed here in silence over the commemoration of the redemptive work of Christ . . . and over the Institution . . . and over the Anamnesis itself." Fr. Hebert has pointed out that this is an assumption. But there are grounds for going further, and calling it a mistaken assumption.

(1) It is a singular way of covering half the text of the Anaphora, this one word εἶτα, when his hearers were quite *unfamiliar* with the rite and would not know what intervened. (2) After expounding the Epiclesis, Cyril passes straight on to explain the Intercession, which still follows immediately on the Epiclesis in *St. James.* And again his connecting link is the one word εἶτα. Why should not the same word have its natural meaning in both cases—"Next"? (3) It is remarkable that while verbal reminiscences of nearly every clause in the Preface, Epiclesis and Intercession of the present text of *St. James* are found scattered over Cyril's lectures, it is impossible to identify *one* sentence from all that now stands in *St. James* between Sanctus and Epiclesis.* (4) The

* St. Cyril's evidence is collected by Brightman, LEW, App. B. He does the best he can for the "missing" sections of the Anaphora with scriptural citations common to Cyril and the present *St. James.* But do these affect the question ?

earliest certain Syrian evidence for a normal Anamnesis in the Hippolytan place is that it is so found in the liturgy of *Ap. Constitutions* viii. (*c.* A.D. 375). But there it is an admitted literary borrowing from Hippolytus himself, whose *Apostolic Tradition* lay before the author of *Ap. Const.* when he wrote. It is to be noted that *Ap. Const.* reproduces here every word of Hippolytus' own Anamnesis, quite contrary to the *Constitutions*' usual practice in dealing with this source. It rather looks as though the author had no other model to go upon at this point of the rite. (5) St. John Chrysostom's writings make it clear that the Antiochene liturgy in his day contained both Institution and Epiclesis, but I have been unable to find a trace of an Anamnesis. No importance can be attached to such negative evidence, except that he can hardly have held it for the cardinal point of the rite.

(*b*) We turn now to the East Syrian *Liturgy of Addai and Mari*. In its earliest recoverable form this did not contain the Institution, or so much as speak of the Sacrament as the Body and Blood of Christ.

Here is the relevant passage: "And we also, O my Lord, Thy servants weak and frail and miserable, who are gathered in Thy Name and stand before Thee, and have received by tradition the example which is from Thee [rejoicing and glorifying and exalting and commemorating and performing this great and holy and life-giving and divine likeness of the passion and death and burial and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.] May there come, O my Lord, Thy Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation. . . ."

We are here in a very different atmosphere from that of Hippolytus. This rite is altogether Semitic in feeling and expression, whereas Hippolytus, though Jewish in form, is Hellenistic in its ideas. This prayer is addressed to the Son, not to the Father. There is no account of the Institution, though the reference to "the example which is from Thee" may be taken as a compendious substitute for it. Similarly,

---

Of course St. Cyril talked about the Last Supper and cited the Gospel accounts of it in speaking of the Eucharist to the Catechumens. But (unless we assume that it must have been there) this does not prove that the Institution stood in his liturgy. It is precisely the non-scriptural elaborations and conflations in the present Institution text of *St. James* which are not in Cyril. Brightman gives the words "took bread—into his undefiled (ἀχράντων) hands," as proof that Cyril knew the present Institution text of *St. James*. But Cyril does not quite say that. "Took bread" stands in a different lecture from the rest! Brightman's reference for this (*Cat.* xx. 5) turns out to be to the Passion—"Christ received the nails into His undefiled hands and feet"—which proves nothing. When all Brightman's references in Cyril for the "missing" part of the Anaphora are verified, the facts are as stated above. It is an instance of the way the assumption I am questioning leads even the greatest masters to force the evidence.

"We Thy servants . . . who are gathered in Thy Name and stand before Thee," may be taken (remembering the special Semitic significance of "prayer in the name" of a God) as the equivalent of Hippolytus' "Stand before Thee and minister as priests to Thee." But in *Addai and Mari* this comes *before* Institution and Anamnesis, not after it, as in Hippolytus. The "standard outline" is not being followed. What, then, are we to make of the clear and developed Anamnesis ensuing?

It cannot be demonstrated to be an interpolation; we have no early MSS. of this rite. But there are grounds for suspecting its originality. There is obviously some incoherence in the structure of the prayer between Anamnesis and Epiclesis.* The sentence "And we . . ." has no main verb; something has fallen out and been replaced by a "patch." In the phrasing of the Anamnesis there is a sudden change of address from a direct prayer to the Son to speaking of Him in the third person. This, which is the characteristic of the admitted later changes and interpolations in other parts of this Anaphora, is as suspicious as the sudden wordiness of the prayer at this point, and the analysis of "death" into "passion and death and burial," which are as a rule marks of later development. *Addai and Mari* must be treated as at best neutral evidence for the existence of a primitive Syrian Anamnesis.

* * * * *

This summary analysis of the earliest Egyptian and Syrian evidence does not by itself *demonstrate* that the third-century Egyptian and Syrian rites lacked an Anamnesis of the Hippolytan type in the "standard" position. It is always difficult to prove a negative, and in default of actual liturgical texts of the third century from these regions it would be impossible to prove this one. But considered in itself, what evidence there is certainly does not support the assumption that these rites did contain an Anamnesis; rather, to me, it suggests considerable doubt.

The Anamnesis following the Institution is now the one point of contact between the Roman Canon and the Byzantine outline in all that intervenes between the Sanctus and Doxology. Is this particular sequence so firmly embedded in Roman tradition because it was originally a Roman *peculiarity*? Other rites may well have contained an equivalent in a quite

* So Mr. Ratcliff also thinks (art. cit., p. 29). But he would remove the Epiclesis altogether, as not original. On grounds too complicated to state here I believe that some sort of Epiclesis is ancient in Syrian rites. It is the Anamnesis which seems to interrupt the sequence of the prayer as he reconstructs it.

different form and position. There is, I think, evidence that some, at all events, did so (*e.g.*, *Sarapion*). But these alternatives need investigating. So far as they are discernible, even though they may, in the long run, amount to the same conception, they are much less explicit and more clumsy than the formula in Hippolytus. This last has, indeed, already something of that lapidary expressiveness and unemotional terseness, that combination of theology with practical "usability," which distinguishes other formulæ that the local Church of Rome has given to Christendom (*e.g.*, ὁμοούσιος). There were circumstances in the fourth century in which such a usage as that of the Anamnesis might have been diffused rapidly without any direct Roman impulse, and without any one being particularly aware that it was once peculiar to Rome.

Only, before we lay the whole weight of the primitive eucharistic *actio* in general on this one element in Hippolytus' prayer, we do need to consider whether it was universal, and, if not, what equivalent it had in other rites.

III

Preface and Sanctus

"Preface" is used here for the opening of the Eucharistic Prayer in all rites, regardless of whether this contained a reference to the Angels and culminated in the Sanctus, or not.

Hippolytus opens his Anaphora thus: "We render thanks to Thee, O God, through Thy Beloved Child [παῖς, 'The Servant'] Jesus Christ, Whom in the last times Thou didst send to us <*to be*> a Saviour and Redeemer and the Angel [ἄγγελος, Messenger, from Mal. iii. 1] of Thy counsel; Who is Thy Word, inseparable <*from Thee*>, through Whom Thou madest all things, and in Whom Thou wast well-pleased; <*Whom*> Thou didst send . . .," and so to a recital of the Incarnation and Atonement.

Sixty years or so before Hippolytus, St. Justin Martyr (*c.* A.D. 155) gives us two brief accounts of the Preface at Rome, thus: (*a*) *Apol.* i. 65: "The bishop sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." (*b*) *Dialogue*, 41: "We give thanks to God for that He created the world and all things in it for man, and hath delivered us from the evil wherein we were born. . . ." It may be said that these two descriptions are not very closely agreed. But (*a*) taken by itself would correspond in idea with Hippolytus' first clause, save that the latter does not mention the Holy Ghost. And (*b*), in the whole passage

from which this is taken, corresponds rather closely (for a summary) with Hippolytus' whole scheme as far as the Institution, except that thanksgiving for creation makes a more definite point in Justin than in the latter, where it is rather brought in in passing. But it is clear that in phrasing his Anaphora Hippolytus was especially anxious to bring in his own personal theories on the relation of the Father to the Son, which were in dispute when he wrote the *Apostolic Tradition*. It may well be that this preoccupation has unconsciously emphasized this theme in his prayer, at the expense of other elements more clearly brought out in the traditional Roman scheme. I shall take it, on the strength of the Roman evidence as a whole and of that of other rites, that "giving thanks to God for creation" —perhaps for creation through the Son and the Spirit—was the keynote of the old Roman Preface.

This note is persistent, too, in Eastern Prefaces. But in these the idea is sometimes given the slightly different turn of describing "creation praising God." It may seem a small distinction. But this notion applied to the Angels leads directly to the Sanctus, for which Hippolytus' outline leaves no room. It will be convenient this time to take the Syrian and Egyptian evidence in reverse order.

1. Syria.—(*a*) *Addai and Mari*. It is generally admitted* that the references to the Angels, and the Sanctus, in the Preface of this rite are an interpolation. The Preface as a whole, though it contains ancient material, has been "worked over" at a later date, so that we shall neglect it here.

(*b*) St. Cyril of Jerusalem and *St. James*. The Preface, with a fully developed description of the Angelic hierarchy, and the Sanctus, were clearly already present in St. Cyril's rite in A.D. 348, in much the form of *St. James*. This opens with the note of "thanking God for creation," but soon passes to that of "creation praising God," which is emphasized by St. Cyril. A comparison of this Preface with that of *Sarapion* (A.D. 340) at once reveals distinct points of literary contact between the two. As *Sarapion's* material seems to come from before the period of Syrian influence upon Egyptian liturgy, it is conceivable that in this case Jerusalem originally borrowed from Egyptian rites.

2. Egypt.—*Sarapion's* Preface runs thus (points of special interest italicized):

§ 1. "It is meet and right to praise, to hymn, to glorify Thee, the uncreated Father of the Only-begotten, Jesus Christ. We praise Thee, O God, uncreated, unsearchable, ineffable, incomprehensible to any created being. We praise Thee Who

* So, *e.g.*, Ratcliff, art. cit., p. 29.

art known of the Son, the Only-begotten, Who by Him art spoken and interpreted and made known to all creatures. We praise Thee 'Who knowest the Son and revealest' (Mt. xi. 27) to the Saints the doctrines concerning Him, Who art known and seen by Thy begotten Word and interpreted by Him unto the Saints. We praise Thee, Father invisible, source of immortality. Thou art the fount of life, the fount of light, the fount of all grace, of all truth, O Thou lover of men and lover of the poor, Who art reconciled with all men and drawest all to Thyself by the Incarnation of Thy beloved Son.

§ 2. "We pray Thee make us living men; grant us the Spirit of light, that we may know Thee, the True, and Him Whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ; grant us <*the*> Holy Spirit that we may be able to tell forth and recount Thy unspeakable mysteries. *May the Lord Jesus speak in us and* <*the*> *Holy Spirit, and hymn Thee through us.*

§ 3. "For Thou art far above all principality and power and might and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come. Beside Thee stand thousand thousands and myriad myriads of angels and archangels, 'thrones, dominations, principalities, powers' (Col. i. 16); beside Thee stand the *two most reverend* (τιμιώτατα) *Seraphim* with six wings, with twain hiding *the face* (τὸ πρόσωπον), with twain the feet, with twain flying, and hallowing Thee; with whom receive also our hallowing as we say: 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth; full is' the heaven and 'the earth of Thy glory.' (Is. vi. 3).

§ 4. "Full is the heaven, full also is the earth of Thy splendid glory, O Lord of the powers; fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy partaking (τῆς σῆς μεταλήψεως); for unto Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this unbloody oblation.

§ 5. "Unto Thee have we offered this bread . . .", and so by an abrupt transition, to the Institution.

This is a fine piece of work, if a little disconcerting in places. What is remarkable is that there is here no direct reference to creation at all, and certainly not to creation by the Word. How far does this fourth-century prayer represent general Egyptian tradition, and especially older tradition?

§ 1, though more developed than the corresponding passage in Hippolytus, has at least the resemblance that both are concerned with the relation of Father and Son, to the exclusion of the Holy Ghost. But whatever *Sarapion* may here contain of older material, it has certainly undergone deliberate revision in this passage in the fourth century. § 1 is an unpolemical but nevertheless direct repudiation of Arianism in its original

form as put forward by Arius himself. Sarapion was the friend and right-hand of Athanasius in Egypt.*

Of § 2 we shall say more later; it certainly rests on older material. §§ 3 and 4 are represented thus in the Alexandrian *Liturgy of St. Mark* (here the chief variants from *Sarapion* are italicized):

§ 3. ("For Thou art . . . is to come," as in *Sar.*) "Beside Thee stand thousand thousands and myriad myriads of the *holy* angels and *the armies* of the archangels, beside Thee stand the two most reverend *living creatures* (τιμιώτατα ζῶα), *the many-eyed Cherubim and* the Seraphim with six wings, with twain covering *their faces* (τὰ πρόσωπα) and with twain the feet, and with twain flying, and they cried one to the other. . . . For all things hallow Thee for ever. Receive, then, our hallowing also with all that hallows Thee, as with them we hymn Thee, saying: 'Holy . . . ' (with *Sar.'s* variant from Is. vi. 3).

§ 4. "Full in very truth is the heaven and the earth of Thy holy glory, *by the manifestation of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ.* Fill, O God, this sacrifice also with Thy *blessing by the over*-shadowing of Thine all-Holy Spirit."

Obviously this is a textual tradition closely related to that in *Sarapion.* Some slight variants may be due to later editing, but I must leave it to the references below† to shew that those italicized here (except "their faces") go back certainly to the time of Athanasius at Alexandria, and earlier. This means that Thmuis and Alexandria used variants of the same old Egyptian tradition, and since we can trace the *variants* in the fourth century, the substance of the tradition should be older, as we shall see in fact it was.

But first, what are *Sarapion's* mysterious "two most reverend Seraphim", or "Living Creatures" as Athanasius and the Alexandrian Church called them? These are a feature peculiar to the Egyptian tradition of the Preface in extant

* There are good reasons for dating the whole "Prayer-Book of Sarapion" before rather than after A.D. 340. It seems to be a conservative revision of the inherited liturgical tradition of his church made by Sarapion soon after he became bishop of the country town of Thmuis in the Nile delta. (He was bishop before A.D. 339.) The prayers must have gone out of liturgical use in this form before *c.* A.D. 370, or they would have been revised afresh. Some things in them—*e.g.*, the doxologies—are old-fashioned forms which had become *distinctive* of Arianism in the eyes of the orthodox in Egypt by about that time.

† § 3. Origen, *de Principiis*, iv. 3, 14 (ed. Lommatzsch, xxi. 459) has the variant *armies of the holy angels* (*cf. inf.*). Athanasius: *In illud, Omnia Mihi, Hom.* vi. (*Opp.* ed. Montfaucon, Paris, 1698, i. 108), knew the form containing ζῶα and Cherubim as well as *Sar.'s* "Seraphim." (Clement Al., *Strom.* vii 12 *ad fin.* on *Is.* vi. 1-3, speaks of ζῶα instead of "Seraphim," which may or may not be significant.) It is the ζῶα which are "many-eyed," *ap.* St. Isidore of Pelusium (*c.* A.D. 430), *Ep.* i. 29 (PG, 78, 200). § 4 For *by the manifestation, etc.*, as a comment on the Sanctus, *cf.* Origen, *Hom. in Is.* i. 2 and iv. 2 (ed. Lommatzsch, xiii. 243, 260).

liturgical texts. Originally they are certainly the two celestial beings of Is. vi. 1, where the Septuagint text presupposes only two Seraphim.* But why τιμιώτατα, a word not referable to Scripture?

Origen, *de Principiis* i. 3, 4, writes thus concerning "the two Seraphim" of Is. vi. and their cry of "Holy": "All knowledge of the Father when the Son reveals Him is made known to us through the Holy Ghost. So both of these, who in the words of the prophet† *are called* ζῶα, are the cause of our knowledge of God the Father. For as it is said of the Son that 'no one knoweth the Father but the Son, or he to whom the Son will reveal Him' (Mt. xi. 27), so in the same way does the Apostle speak of the Holy Ghost—'God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God.'"

Here is the Alexandrian identification of the ζῶα with the Seraphim of the Sanctus. The thought of Origen in the preceding passage is as much preoccupied with the Sanctus as any eucharistic Preface could be. And the thought of the Sanctus at once raises in his own mind, first, the idea of the Son and Spirit, as revealing the unknowable Father; secondly, the two ζῶα, which the Alexandrian traditional Preface-form substituted for the "two Seraphim" of Is. vi. 1, which Origen had quoted. Here and elsewhere Origen expressly identifies these ζῶα, and the Seraphim of the normal text, with the Son and the Holy Ghost. When we look at *Sarapion's* Preface, with its concentration on the *same* idea of the Son revealing the unknowable Father, its introduction of the *same* text, Mt. xi. 27, and its "telling forth the unspeakable mysteries" of God by the power of the Holy Ghost, it begins to look as though *Sarapion* represents, for all its anti-Arian editing, a traditional Egyptian arrangement of the introduction to the Sanctus, which was also in the mind of Origen when he wrote this passage about the Sanctus before A.D. 225.

Origen has also another passage on this head in the *de Principiis* iv. 3, 14, which sustains this idea: "My Hebrew teacher also used to teach as follows: Since the beginning or the end of all things could not be comprehended by any except our Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, this was the reason why Isaiah spoke of there being in the vision that appeared to him only two Seraphim, who with two wings cover the face

* This interpretation was usual. *Cf.* the ninth Respond at Matins of Sundays in August, etc., in the Roman Breviary (twelfth Respond in the Monastic Breviary), *Duo Seraphim clamabant*, where the Vulgate has only *Seraphim*.

† *Habacuc* iii. 2 (LXX). The "Song of Habacuc," which was the Canticle of the Christian Paschal feast as far back as the second century, furnished more than one important idea to early liturgy.

of God, with two cover *His* feet and with two fly, crying one to another and saying 'Holy . . . glory.' For because the two Seraphim alone have their wings over the face of God and over His feet, we may venture to say that neither *the armies of the holy angels* nor the holy *thrones nor dominations nor principalities nor powers* can wholly know the beginnings of all things. . . ."

We are not here concerned with the cogency of the exegesis but with the liturgical bearing of this passage. Here again the "Seraphim" are expressly equated with the Son and the Holy Ghost.* The mention of the Sanctus at once recalls to his mind "the armies of the holy angels" and the citation of Col. i. 16, as these stood together in close collocation with the Sanctus in the Egyptian tradition of the Preface.

Putting together the evidence of *Sarapion* and Origen, we can thus make out the main lines of the Egyptian Preface at a date within ten years or so of the publication of Hippolytus' Anaphora, and it must be confessed that it has unexpected elements. We can now see that *Sarapion's* Preface still faithfully reflects the old idea that the wings of the Seraphim veil "*The* Face" (*i.e.* of God), while *St. Mark* was adapted to the later notion of "*their* faces." And *Sarapion's* § 2, with its reference to "the Lord Jesus speaking in us and the Holy Spirit hymning Thee through us" (*i.e.* in the Sanctus), still carries on the old idea of that hymn as sung to the glory of the Father primarily *by the Son and Holy Ghost themselves*. We may compare this once again with Origen, *Hom. in Is.* i. 2 (ed. cit., xiii., p. 242), "And not lightly do they cry the One to the Other 'Holy' but they proclaim aloud a confession profitable (*salutarem*) to all. Who are these two Seraphim? My Lord Jesus and the Holy Ghost."

If explicit teaching of this kind was to be found in the old Egyptian liturgical tradition, fourth-century bishops might well feel the need of a discreet revision to meet the new Arian danger. It was not the first or last time the liturgy has been made to reflect theological developments. It is a commonplace that ritual tends to "fossilize" archaic ideas. But it is not sufficiently realized that in Christian history this means that the liturgy always continues to preserve archaic turns of speech and doctrine long after the up-to-date and well-educated frequenters of the theological schools have taken to

* This is Origen's normal teaching; *cf.*, *e.g.*, *Hom. in Is. passim.* St. Jerome, when it suited him (*Comm. in Is.* iii., *in* vi. 1) professed to find it "impious." But he had not boggled at translating it when he made our Latin version of Origen's *Hom. in Is.*, as Rufinus reminded him later on (*Adv. Hieron.* ii. 27). St. Cyril of Alexandria, *in Is.* i. 4 (PG, 70, 173C) knows Origen's interpretation, but not as a liturgical tradition.

thinking in quite different terms, and often about quite different conceptions. When the liturgy is ultimately made to conform to the new way of thinking, it will generally be found—just because liturgy is a conservative *popular* thing and not the preserve of a progressive theological *élite*—that the changes are made awkwardly and inadequately, that the rite continues, by some incoherence or apparent irrationality, to preserve traces of the ancient conception. So the two "Seraphim" or ζῶα of the Egyptian Prefaces remained τιμιώτατα in *St. Mark*, "very reverend," even after they had been degraded into angels.

Yet we need not blame the fourth-century revisers. How likely the old formulæ were to foster Arian tendencies may be judged from what C. H. Turner virtually proved* is the original form of the Preface in the liturgy of the Arian *Apostolic Constitutions* viii.: "Thee the whole bodiless and holy array worships; *Thee the Paraclete worships* (προσκυνεῖ), and before all, Thy holy Child (παῖς) Jesus the Christ, our Lord and God and the Angel (ἄγγελος) and high Captain of Thy power, the eternal and perpetual high Priest; Thee the well-ordered armies of the angels worship . . ." Of the words italicized Turner wrote, "They are by the second hand over an erasure . . . but I do not doubt that it was some close connection in the original of the Holy Spirit with angelic spirits which was the motive of the erasure."

This passage, with its insistence on προσκυνήσις by the Son and the Holy Ghost, is a deliberate sharpening of the idea found in Origen, with a positively heretical intention. But Origen himself, with the mention of his "Hebrew teacher" (presumably a Jewish Christian), professes only to draw on earlier tradition. It was, in fact, good early Christian doctrine, going back to first-century sources. There is, *e.g.*, that first or very early second century Judæo-Christian apocryphal book *The Vision of Isaiah*, in which the prophet in heaven "saw that my Lord worshipped, and the Angel of the Spirit, and that both of them together glorified God. And immediately . . . all the saints and angels drew near and worshipped, and all the angels glorified" (ix. 31).

Or again, so orthodox a Gentile bishop as St. Irenæus of Lyons, *c.* A.D. 190, could write a passage like the following, in what he himself called "A Manual of Essentials" for the Christian laity: "Now this God is glorified by His Word Who is His Son continually, and by the Holy Spirit, Who is the Wisdom of the Father of all: and the powers of both of these . . . which are called Cherubim and Seraphim, with unceasing voices

* *J.T.S.*, xvi. 59 *seq.* The text printed LEW, p. 18, is the ancient bowdlerized version of most MSS.

glorify God, and every created thing which is in heaven offers glory to God the Father of all."* Such a passage is not sufficient to prove that a Preface on these lines stood in the second-century rite of Lyons, as Origen and *Sarapion* in combination just suffice, I think, to prove it stood in the third-century rite of Alexandria. But at least the *idea* would not have been so unfamiliar to a second-century Catholic as it seems to us today. After all it is not so far in conception from that passage, with which we started, from St. Justin: " The bishop sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

I suggest that though the evidence is delicate, we can dimly make out a different development of the Preface in certain Churches *contemporarily* with the writing of Hippolytus' Anaphora, a development which was already over and done with by the age of Nicæa, but which has nevertheless permanently affected the Preface of every liturgy in Christendom. But should we be able to discern this at all in the light of Hippolytus, or on the theory that it represents a " single primitive standard type "? Or even—and this opens up other questions—should we have so much as guessed, on the basis of this accepted theory, at the possibilities—whether of past history in the Roman rite or future development—lying behind that phrase in Hippolytus' own Preface, " The *Angel* of Thy counsel "?

IV

This may appear to be niggling over details of the Anaphora, but it was necessary to make clear by illustrations (I fear somewhat repellently technical) the nature of the whole case against the thesis so brilliantly defended by Dr. Frere.† Now let us look at general principles.

* *Epideixis* X, ed. Armitage Robinson, p. 79. It was the note on this passage by this greatest of English patristic scholars in our day which first aroused my own curiosity on this point of the Preface.

† The illustrations are of course in no sense exhaustive. There is, *e.g.*, that prayer of the Roman Canon, *Supplices Te*: " We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, bid that (the offerings) be carried by the hand of Thy holy Angel to Thy heavenly altar in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty." Dr. Frere passes it by without comment. Yet a similar prayer stood in the Alexandrian anaphora *c.* A.D. 400 (*cf.* W. H. Codrington, *J.T.S.*, xxxix. 141 *seq.*), and traces of it still linger in the " Prayer for the Offerers " of *St. Mark* (LEW, p. 124). A similar prayer that " the good God will receive the oblation by the mediation of His Christ upon His heavenly altar " stands in the post-anaphoral litany of *Ap. Const.* viii. (LEW, p. 23), and in a later form in the Byzantine rites of *St. Basil* and *St. Chrysostom* (*ibid.*, p. 390). We cannot prove that such a prayer, evidently general in the later fourth century, stood in any pre-Nicene rite; it may have spread by fourth-century borrowings. But at least the *idea* of the " heavenly altar " was entirely familiar to pre-Nicene thought about the Eucharist. I would go so far as to say that it lies very near the centre of the early doctrine of the sacrifice (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.*, iv. 18. 6). In view of the case set out by the Bishop of Lincoln in *The Fulness of Sacrifice* (whatever

The chief buttress of the accepted theory is the Anaphora of Hippolytus, which is taken as representing the " early standard outline," in Dr. Frere's phrase. But there are grounds for believing—(1) that certain things in Hippolytus' rite were not then universal, and (2) that it does not contain other things then in use in other Churches. If this be true, the accepted theory becomes at once inadequate as a basis of study. It suffers, indeed, from a radical defect of method, the process of argument from the unknown to the known; and Dr. Frere's exceptionally lucid presentation of it only emphasizes the fact.

The critical point in the history of the liturgy is the fourth century. We have to remember that it was then that Christian worship underwent the greatest single change of circumstances in its whole history, the change from a private practice—not necessarily secret but always illegal and under the threat of police action—into a public worship at whose disposal Emperors put the resources of the public treasury and the fisc. Though it underwent no internal revolutionary change of conception, the liturgy was bound to become an ampler and more formal thing after Constantine had " restored the basilicas " than it had been before Diocletian confiscated them. Secondly, the fourth century saw an unparalleled deepening and strengthening of the Church's own grasp of the intellectual content of the traditional faith, and this process was extraordinarily swift, occupying no more than two generations. Even in our scanty evidence we can trace everywhere the impact of this doctrinal clarification upon the old phrases of the liturgy in this period. It was a time of ceaseless liturgical revision. Thirdly, it is in the fourth century that Councils and the embryonic Patriarchates effectively break down the old virtual (though not theoretical) self-sufficiency of the local church (παροικία), self-governing under its own bishop. Provincial organization appears and becomes a working reality, based on secular analogies. The old customary law and local tradition which had hitherto guided the Churches give way before statute law, in the shape of conciliar enactments and imperial decrees. The result was a " levelling up " and standardization in every department of Church life. There is comparison and adjustment and exchange between the traditions of the Churches on a scale never known before. We can trace it with great ease in such things as doctrinal formulæ and biblical texts.

When we try to pierce back behind this period of change in

---

readjustments that book may need, especially in Part III), a " satisfactory revision " of the Prayer Book rite could hardly afford to ignore this conception (supposing there was any real desire to express the classic doctrine of the Eucharist) merely because it is not expressed in Hippolytus.

other departments—*e.g.*, in doctrinal formulæ about the Trinity or in Gospel texts—we find a local variety which the smooth post-fourth-century surface would hardly indicate. When we push back the investigation in matters liturgical to the furthest point our solid evidence, actual liturgical *texts*, will take us, something at first sight very like "liturgical anarchy" appears. We can document three traditions, at Rome, in Egypt, and in Syria. (There must have been another tradition, of at least equal importance, that of the Apostolic Churches of Asia, but for this we have virtually no evidence at all,* and the case is not much better with the ancient churches of Africa, Gaul and Spain.) And they are all exceedingly different when *we first meet them*, and grow more alike as they progress. On the accepted theory, it should be the other way about.

It is not merely that the regional traditions have already very different developments behind them when we first meet them. Even within the same region, Syria, the rites of Jerusalem, Edessa, and Antioch seem to have differed notably from one another in the fourth century.† A traveller round the churches in Constantine's day would have found the most bewildering variety—Anaphoras with and without the Institution, with and without the Epiclesis or Sanctus; the Intercessions here in Litany form and there in the old form of collects, in one church confined to the "Prayers of the Faithful" at the end of the Synaxis, in another inserted into the Anaphora after the Epiclesis, or in yet another before the Institution. Even where the outline was the same, every "parish" had its own variants of the text. And had our traveller stopped to make a theological analysis of the Anaphoral prayers themselves, he might have found it difficult to reconcile the contents of some of them.

Later in the fourth century, when the period of "levelling-up" begins, Churches borrowed from one another's liturgies, both verbally and in ideas, Rome from Jerusalem, Jerusalem from Egypt, Egypt from both the others, and so on; and the process continued, piecemeal and haphazard. There is too much evidence of direct *literary* contact between clauses of the great rites as these emerge into the clear light of the

* The basic reasons for this (besides the deliberate introduction of Byzantine rites, which was the imperial policy from the fifth century onwards) I take to be—(1) the deliberate burning of all the old monastic libraries in Asia during the iconoclastic persecutions under Constantine V, and (2) the barbaric nature of the Turkish invasions and the nomad raids which preceded and accompanied them. Their purposeless destruction annihilated the remaining monuments of Christian antiquity, especially in the monasteries of the old Roman province of Asia, so that we have fewer literary remains of the pre-Nicene period from these Churches than from any other. We can only hope that chance discoveries elsewhere, like the recent find of a papyrus copy of Melito of Sardis (*c.* 175 A.D.), Περὶ τοῦ Πάθους, in Egypt, will at least give us something to guess about concerning the early Asian liturgical tradition.

† But the influences at work in Syria were exceptionally complicated.

earliest extant liturgical MSS. for any other conclusion to be possible. Meanwhile the early Gallican rites were forming, of which Dr. Frere himself writes as an "amalgam . . . resembling Byzantium in one point, Milan in a second, Ireland in a third, and so on" (*The Anaphora*, p. 116). Had he ever made a detailed textual study of the Eastern rites (he once told me he had not done this) and their relations with the Roman, he could hardly have missed the point that this applies to *all* rites from *Apost. Const.* viii. onwards, in different degrees. There is no such thing as an entirely "pure" local rite in Christendom. It is this which accounts for that later appearance of uniformity of scheme which the earliest evidence so belies.

We can hardly as yet press the question back behind the fourth century with much assurance; too much detailed research remains to be done before we have exhausted the possibilities of the fourth-century evidence itself. But when we do so, it is likely that the third century may reveal local diversity at its maximum (as is clear, *e.g.*, in the case of MSS. of the Scriptures). Hippolytus' Anaphora will provide a welcome ray of light on *one* tradition in this period; but this rite itself raises as many problems as it solves. Like all the prayers in the *Apostolic Tradition* it claims to be already "traditional" in substance in A.D. 215 at Rome—*i.e.*, it has a history *before* as well as after it reaches Hippolytus.* It may well be that more than one *stratum* of development lies behind the Anaphora as it came from Hippolytus' pen; though if this be so, it is hard at present to see how they are to be distinguished except on a basis of pure hypothesis.

Yet though the early history of liturgical development seems likely to prove much more complicated than has been supposed, and though there are (to my thinking) evident signs in third and fourth century evidence of the interaction of two different basic liturgical and doctrinal traditions, the one concentrating on the idea that in the eucharistic elements we receive Divine πνεῦμα, the other that we receive the Body and Blood of Christ, it is not necessary therefore to abandon the belief that the pre-Nicene understanding of the rite was essentially the same everywhere, even though it took very different expressions. We are not reduced to Lietzmann's hypothesis of an original opposition of eucharistic doctrine and practice between St. Paul on the one hand and that of "the Twelve" and the Church of Jerusalem on the other—

* Similarly I have pointed out that Hippolytus' Blessing of Oil of the Sick embodies a reference to a *pre-Christian* Jewish legend which Hippolytus himself has not clearly understood, and which later versions of the prayer have altogether lost sight of. *Laudate*, xiv., p. 231 *seq.*

theology_1938-12_37_222

i.e., between Jewish and Gentile Churches*—to account for this dualism.

The Church everywhere was the child of the Synagogue, but the Synagogue itself was not in the first century the homogeneous body it afterwards became. It was bisected by a cross-division which runs, not between Palestine and the Diaspora, but between Hellenistic Judaism and what I may call "Semitic" Judaism, which includes the majority of the whole Diaspora in Mesopotamia, and Syria with inland Palestine, as well as colonies elsewhere. If I understand early Christian history aright, the radical cross-division of Christendom down to the later fourth century was not quite that with which we are familiar, between East and West, Greek and Latin, but between Semitic and Hellenistic Christianities. Territorially it runs approximately along the same lines as in Judaism.†

Semitic Judaism ultimately obliterated its Hellenistic sister; it was Christian not Jewish scribes who perpetuated writers like Philo and Josephus. Semitic Christianity was never in any position to do the like by Hellenistic Christianity. It is a dwindling force by the fourth century. But where it was able to make its influence felt, in the borderland formed by the Greek cities of Syria, it has introduced an element markedly distinct from the normal Hellenistic tradition, and one primary case of this is in the eucharistic liturgy. And as things turned out, Syria, with its capital Antioch and Jerusalem the Holy City, was a liturgical *fons* more generally powerful even than Rome in the later fourth and early fifth centuries.

Granted the truth of this early cross-division in Christianity, I think that those who have most carefully studied the different religious genius of the Semitic and Hellenistic mind and spirit will most readily admit that they would at once and inevitably express *the same* original conception in the most diverse ways.

This is a brief and general summary of the theory of early liturgical history which I venture to submit in place of that now most widely accepted among liturgiologists. It would require considerable detailed research and testing by the available evidence before it could be considered secure, a great deal of which is beyond my own competence, though I have tested it minutely on many points, far more than appear here, and not found it to fail.

* This seems to be one more of those visitations by the ghost of F. C. Baur to which German scholarship is still liable, even though the artificial character of the Tübingen theory of Apostolic history is now generally recognized.

† We have no clear evidence as to where the Churches of Asia stood in this respect, but such indications as there are point to these *Pauline* Churches having originally stood, at least in some things, opposed to the Hellenistic tradition as a whole—*e.g.*, on the date of the Paschal feast.

If it be true, it brings out one aspect of the history of liturgy which merits special consideration among ourselves today, the fact that all liturgies are the continuous product of the organic life, not only of individual Churches, but in some sense of the whole Church. The liturgy is too great a thing to be controlled by individual men, however holy or authoritative. Even the great classic rites are never immobile, never live " to themselves alone," though each has its special beauties and local genius. A Sarapion, a Basil, a Gregory, may re-order the rite of his own Church, but his precise arrangement never endures, even in his own Church. The best of it may remain, but the best of later ages and other Churches will soon pass into it and adorn it, overlay it and, it may be, replace it. The most obstinately peculiar and conservative of all rites is that of Rome, whose purest expression is the Mass-book of Gregory the Great. Pope Gregory compiled it from the " authentic traditions " of his See, inheriting from Gelasius and Leo and Damasus and Hippolytus and who knows how many more, and " adding somewhat of his own." In that " authentic tradition " there were already important elements from Syria and Egypt, and there were not wanting purists in his own day to accuse him of " foreign imitations " in what he himself contributed. And after him Pope Sergius added the *Agnus Dei* from Syria; and the singers of the *Schola* added the Alleluias from Byzantium, because they liked the tunes; and Pope Leo added the recitation of the Nicene Creed, from the rite of the Palace at Aix-la-Chapelle (originally a private trick of Monophysites at Constantinople to slight the Council of Chalcedon); and others added the Reproaches from Spain, and the Holy Fire and Paschal Candle from Milan and Toledo (originally from Jerusalem); and Alcuin the Englishman doubled the size of Pope Gregory's book from the rites of Gaul (which had borrowed again from Campania and Spain and Milan); and Frankish monks added the Offertory Prayers. And the result, standardized at Rome in the eleventh century by German Popes, with the addition of Crusading Votives from *Outremer*, and Franciscan sequences from Tuscany, and a ceremonial codified by a Bavarian Master of Ceremonies at the Renaissance, with some pompous baroque collects, and about 250 later Propers and a few other items, is the Roman Missal—the very type of an obstinately peculiar and conservative rite !

And it is so with all other rites, those of the " unchanging East " as well as the mutable West; except that in the East the Churches have the disconcerting habit of discarding their entire tradition for foreign importations. The Byzantine rites are lovely and ancient—but in origin they are Antiochene.

theology_1938-12_37_222

The old Byzantine rite of the days of Chrysostom and Proclus and Nestorius now survives fragmentarily only in a minor Anaphora of the martyred Assyrian Church, and perhaps in traces among the Armenians. I have spoken of the rite of *St. James* as that of Jerusalem; but today they use at Jerusalem the liturgies of *St. Basil* and *St. Chrysostom*, except once a year when they use *St. James*, which is used also in the Ægean island of Zacynthus, where it has no business to be. I have spoken of the Alexandrian rite of *St. Mark*; but the tradition of Athanasius and Cyril has perished from Egypt. The Copts now use for the Anaphora only two Syrian importations. Once a year only, on the Friday before Palm Sunday, the little Coptic Uniat body uses the much modified Coptic version of *St. Mark*, the so-called *Liturgy of St. Cyril*. And the traditional liturgy of the Apostolic Church of Ephesus has vanished without a trace, replaced by an importation from Byzantium, a city unrepresented at Nicæa when its bishop was still a petty suffragan of Heraclea.

If such be the flux of liturgy in the flickering light of history, what of the tracing of its pre-history ?

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

CATHEDRAL MUSIC—A PLEA FOR CONSIDERATION

" Is there any taste in the white of an egg ?"
The Book of Job.

" Speak roughly to your little boy,
And beat him when he sneezes;
For he can thoroughly enjoy
The pepper when he pleases."
Alice in Wonderland.

" The carpenter said nothing but
' The butter's spread too thick.' "
Through the Looking Glass.

THOSE who have to do with Cathedral music are engaged at present in a process of reflection. Probably there is no Cathedral in which the routine of tradition is not subject to criticism. New music, or music newly discovered, claims to be heard; and as the Organist or Precentor reviews his repertory to see what should be discarded if this claim is to be wisely met, he finds himself in need of some guiding principle by which omissions and additions can be regulated. There is, for the moment at least, no standard authoritative " white-list," based on the general consent of experts, by which the good can be

distinguished from the mediocre. In default of this, organists naturally tend to fall back on the principle of "Cathedral tradition," which is understood to mean that our Cathedrals ought to preserve and perform representative music from every epoch of our history. But this principle is more serviceable as a brake upon change than as a positive guide to sound judgment: and our music needs a good deal else besides a brake. Energy, and a high degree of artistic skill, it can and does already command; what it needs is a sense of direction and purpose, a constructive policy of advance.

Recent discussions among musicians, and between them and the clergy with whom they work, have plainly revealed this need; they have also revealed the fact that no adequate policy can be framed without asking fundamental preliminary questions. For instance, no satisfying agreement as to the value of a particular type or sample of music can be reached unless the prior problems of the purpose of Church music and its relation to the rite which it interprets have been thought out. We are discovering, at this point, a gap in our musical thinking which needs to be filled up. We find, also, that one subordinate question is always before us; it arises from the natural desire of musicians for self-expression, enhanced as that now is by the resources of modern harmony—what is the legitimate place of emotion in this sphere, and how much do we stand to gain or lose by the employment of rich colouring on the one hand, or by a reversion to austerity on the other?

These are large questions, but they are not in the least academic. The service-lists of any Cathedral do in fact afford an implicit or explicit answer to them all; and an intelligent policy of conscious musical progress cannot be shaped in detail until these matters of underlying principle have been deliberately considered.

As I try to work them out, the quotations prefixed to this paper come into my mind, suggesting that there is some analogy between the problems of a Precentor and those of a housekeeper in her kitchen. Each has to produce a weekly round; to satisfy, or at least to take account of, a wide variety of individual tastes, to proportion the *menu* to the resources available. Each has at command, in theory at least, a wide field of choice; and yet, so potent is tradition on both sides, you would hardly imagine that the common cook has the freedom of the entire vegetable and animal kingdoms, or that the whole world of Church music is open and available to the normal Precentor. As in music so also in cooking, there are traditions higher and lower; traditions of house-pride and dignity as well as of negligence and tame repetition. Some-

times in the kitchen there is a personality which merits free expression; every cook, indeed, whether thus endowed or not, will regard herself as something of a creator, speaking of "my soups," "my puddings"; yet behind every meal devised for us by a lifeless or a living mind, prepared by a light or heavy hand, lies the far-stretching gastronomic past; the effective ingredients of the bill of fare are for the most part pre-determined; we shall be fortunate if just a pinch of real knowledge or fine perception enters into the process by which they are combined for one more dinner.

How is the Precentor to shape *his* policy, for a week, for a year, for five years ahead? What is the real value of the tradition within which he moves? How can he make sure that true creative power has its chance, taking into his treasury things new and good, and sifting out the best from his store of things accepted and old? Faced with all the variety and vagaries of listeners' tastes and composers' temperaments, how is he to be equally just to those who have strong palates and to those austerer spirits who prefer their vintage to be dry?

If he takes these problems of housekeeping seriously, I am convinced that he will make nothing of them unless he starts from the right end, which is the basal principle that worship comes first, with the rite which enacts it, and that all church music owes final allegiance to the words and acts which it illuminates.

But though this principle is central to the whole discussion, I will only touch upon it here in relation to the theme suggested by my texts, which is that of the rightful place of emotion in this sphere.

I observe, before I part company with my analogy, that good housekeeping is very largely concerned with doing ordinary things well. It is not always bent on surprises, contrasts, challenges to the palate, nor always concerned with strong flavours, emphatic seasoning. Good bread, good toast, good porridge, good boiled potatoes, these things, if you can get them, arouse no violent emotion, though, as Coleridge says of the fixed stars, entering unannounced into their own natural home, "there is a silent joy at their arrival." Good bread, the goodness of bread, is apt to be cancelled out by strong flavours. All the simple things which recur daily have a dignity of their own; you would not wish to over-load them with ornament.

To say this, I am aware, is to align oneself with the carpenter; and it is only fair for me to confess that my temperament is on his side. I do enjoy flavours; I am no enemy to

a fried onion at times, but my sensory organs refuse to welcome excessive stimulation. Pepper, for my taste, should be handled lightly, and butter with discretion. In Church music, my mind, I admit, is of a sober cast; to prolonged sonority, opulence of enrichment, flamboyance, it reacts unfavourably, and is apt to find them intrusive. But behind these personal prejudices there lies a principle of judgment, and if I try to explain that, we shall come nearer to the heart of the matter.

A friend who approaches these problems from the standpoint of a musician tells me that music is primarily the expression of emotion, and I think he would say that all real music has, not merely an emotional element, but a definite emotional content, so that as you hear it you do in your mind characterize it as gay or solemn, exultant or subdued, and that if it has none of these qualities, and no vivid contrasts of mood, it is dead or dull. I think I can understand this, though I do not find that the quest for emotion enters actively into my own hearing of music; it seems rather to break in at times in an accidental or secondary way.* It seems to me, when I am listening, that I am just intent on beauty, and that music has a world of interests which is all its own—closer at one time to the emotions, and at another to the intelligence; never, indeed, entirely remote from either, and yet irreducible in fact either to syllogisms or to sentiments. So I could never say that music is primarily an expression of emotion; and I don't think it is that—it is rather a creative art, which evolves a beauty into which feeling enters, as it enters into all the art of sentient beings.

On the other hand it is plain enough that there are many hearers and many musicians to whom the utterance of emotion in music, and the stimulation of emotion through music are of great value: and these have a just claim to be remembered in such a discussion as this.

Let us suppose, then, that we are going to make generous room in Church music for an element of emotionalism, for liberty of self-expression in the realm of feeling. Since a question will obviously arise as to the proper limits of such a liberty, this is the point, I think, at which to indicate a general principle by which the answer to such a question must largely be determined.

If I am writing a string quartet or a rhapsody for the piano, my freedom, within the bounds of the form chosen and the material resources to be employed, will be almost wholly unrestricted. If my temperament is classical, I shall be

* It is paradoxical, perhaps, but I find that what most often stirs me to emotion is *not* the music in which the composer is consciously playing on my nerves.

determined, more or less, by a certain great tradition; if my bent is antinomian or atonal, I shall be swayed by the conventions of modernism. But, subject to such conditions, which may in effect press very lightly on my will, I can throw my weight about just as the wilful muse may happen to inspire me: and the more I can exert and express my personality the better chance the thing will have of coming off when it is heard.

Church music, on the other hand, allows no such unchartered freedom. I suppose it could never be called absolute music, for indeed, it is immediately conditioned through and through by the substance and the spirit of the rite, and more remotely, but still really conditioned by the entire Christian context of tradition, belief and adoration within which the rite is enacted. Unfettered liberty, therefore, can never be claimed by any Church musician, whether he be composer, accompanist or director. His art, however widely it may range, however rich or severe the material which it employs, is a subservient and subordinate art: that is of its essence; and consequently it will always find itself most completely, and come nearest to achieving its purpose, when it loses itself in the transcendent aim which it subserves.

I generalize in this way because I do not think that these generalities have been worked out as fully as they deserve; and on the contrary I feel that argument on these matters tends to be confused or confusing just because it has no tenable philosophy, so to say, behind it, and no bottom of principle underneath.

Well, then, the musician will say to me—I mean especially the colourist, the man with a strong dose of temperament or forceful personality—"Granted that my task is conditioned as you say it is, how closely are you going to tie me down? I can't do genuine work unless I can throw myself into it: how much of myself can you stand, or putting it more kindly, how far can I go in self-expression with the full consent of the worshipper who thinks as you do, and has his heart set upon the rite and the context of the rite?" That is a hard question; not hard, perhaps, if one drops down at once to particulars; on that level, I could at once name a musician whose freedom and restraint, in the utterance of his personality, seem to me to have been quite noble: I could name others whose vigour, intensity or cleverness appear to obtrude themselves excessively. But, in this kind of discussion, the trouble always is that one is constantly being side-tracked by particulars, by queries about Stanford, Smart, Attwood, and so on, which distract the mind from its pursuit of principle. I therefore turn away from such particulars to a general consideration, namely this, that

the case of the musician is just like that of the priest. God needs all his personality, but His requirement is that it should not block the avenue of communication between man's soul and Himself: and just as the priest is to be a medium, but a translucent medium, so the man who makes tunes must make the kind of tune through which all the beauty of worship can and will permeate; and if it is the real thing, it will not cause the worshipper to say "This is Jones indeed," but "That was what Mary meant when she sang Magnificat."

I do not believe that any musician can achieve this without a deliberate purpose of self-sacrifice, since feeling, in our frail human nature, is far from being an unerring guide, and, when divorced from discipline, can easily sink down into sentiment. Those who make use of words, in speech or writing, find that revision usually means deletion, and that under-statement is more effective than its opposite. I believe that a sensitive musician is likely to have a similar experience, and that the tighter the hand he keeps on himself, the more effective will be the relatively rare moments when he deliberately casts restraint aside.

I am putting down these thoughts for people who hear a great deal of singing in church, who may have a considerable influence on what is called the Cathedral tradition, and who mostly have to accept week by week what their Precentor and Organist give them. I should like to learn whether they feel that the Cathedral tradition tends just now to move along the line which I have indicated. I have some doubts on that point. Perhaps it is natural just now, when modern music is so violent in innovation, that Church composers should try out upon us the stimulus of novelty and surprise. We shall know, if we live long enough, what these hardy experiments are worth. But I feel that there is also some general tendency towards expressionism, and I rather think that our scale of values is affected by it. In our service-lists, is it not a more or less accepted convention that Sunday music should be rather florid ? and if so, what does that imply ? Does it not mean that thin colour, reticent art, is somehow less than the best medium for expressing the highest acts of worship, the highest utterance of praise ? Or, to take an obvious example, when we sing a piece of music, a service or anthem, which was composed for a special occasion, do we ever find that it errs on the side of quietude ? Are there any organists who use too few stops, or "chain up" too austerely the "unruly legion" of the modern organ-builder ?

The best symptom to which we can point, in this direction, is the increasingly frequent use of *faux-bourdons* on plain-song

tones for the canticles. I wish this could be fostered more and more: and as I have often urged, I think that the best service that a real composer could render to the Prayer Book would be the handling of the canticles of Matins, especially Benedicite and Benedictus, in this way. Obviously, our lists will always include a wide range of set services of all periods; but the tones and *faux-bourdons*, with their directness and restraint, provide the best possible standard or background by which less simple forms of art can be judged in relation to their purpose.

Most of all, perhaps, I should like to see a deal of thought expended on the problems of plain-song in general, and its place in our services. I know musicians who would feel that any return along that path would be a futile retrogression. They would say that having once emerged from the one-dimensional world of bare melody, music can never revert to it without false archaism. I feel the force of that contention; yet I would balance it by observing—not merely that much modern music does make such a deliberate return—but that the spirit of the plain-chant has somehow managed to survive even in a world which has apparently passed far beyond it. There it still is: who wants to sing *sursum corda*: *habemus ad Dominum* to anything but the ancient rhythm in all its bareness: and who is there that knows our own tone for the Creed, or Merbecke's if you will, but does not find in it all that he needs to sing out his belief? Somehow, in defiance of logic, the thing is very far from being dead.

But for one cardinal mistake made in this country it might be much more alive than it is. Briefly, the fact is that the lead given by Merbecke has never been followed up. Merbecke had some idea of the special character of our language, and that is the explanation of his using one note to a syllable. Our modern advocates of plain-song seem never to have noticed the differences between Latin and English: the inflexional endings of almost every Latin word, which will—*e.g.*, in such a word as *tentationibus*—produce five non-significant syllables, whereas English is marked above all by the rich significance of its monosyllabic words. Try to say, "O God our help in ages past," using only eight Latin syllables, and you will see the point. Briefly again, complex neums, or an excessive use of "female endings" in musical rhythm, make nonsense of our language and make plain-song futile. We need an English plain-chant developed from the point at which Merbecke left off: and one only needs to look at the torture which English words undergo—*e.g.*, in the liturgical plainsong, and some of the hymns, of the *English Hymnal*—to see what has to be shunned.

Why have we failed to evolve a devotional melody of our own, with all the austerity and other-worldliness of the ancient tradition? Simply, I think, because antiquarian correctness has blinded us to the fact that in this field melody must be the servant and helper of living speech, and must take its vitality from the natural rhythm of the language which it is to illustrate.

I do not think it strange, when I reflect on the relative failure of our plain-song pundits, that some of our musicians should have hardened their hearts, missed the secret of plain-song altogether, and asked, in effect: "Is there any taste in the white of an egg?" So I come back to my texts and to my opening analogy. I am not content to be told that the subject of our culinary art "can thoroughly enjoy the pepper when he pleases": and I leave my readers, as I leave off myself, like the carpenter, pondering on simple things—bread and butter—and wondering how these noble elements can best be combined in their right proportion.

H. N. Bate.

THE CENTENARY OF MÖHLER

John Adam Möhler, the centenary of whose death is being kept this year within the Roman Church in Italy, France, and Belgium, was certainly one of the most distinguished German theologians during the early part of the nineteenth century. He was brought up in a religious home with a view to becoming a priest, but Catholicism in Germany at that time was dreary and uninspiring; and Möhler keenly felt the attractiveness of alien ideas. Without parental influence he would have abandoned the study of theology for that of the law; and though his real vocation became gradually clear, yet in the early years of his priesthood he displayed singular independence of the authority to which he was committed. His inclinations were academic rather than pastoral, and after a brief interval of parochial experience he settled down in the University of Tübingen, which combined two theological faculties, one Catholic, the other Protestant. He spent two years in attending lectures at various German Universities, both Protestant and Catholic, and in the course of his wanderings arrived at the newly-founded University of Berlin. Those were the days when Schleiermacher and Hegel were at the height of their influence and divided the student world between them: the one with his subjective theology of feeling and experience; the other with his reliance on abstract reasoning, from which much support for Christianity was at that time confidently but

mistakenly expected. Neither of these two men of European reputation could endure the other, and their mutual aversion was not concealed. Möhler was by disposition far more attracted by Schleiermacher than by Hegel: religious experience appealed where intellectualism did not; yet Möhler could find no resting-place in the lecture rooms of men whose belief in Divine Personality was more than problematical.

There was, however, a third distinguished teacher in Berlin, the highly venerated Lutheran Professor Neander, who fully appreciated Schleiermacher's conception of religion as feeling and experience, but was at the same time firmly convinced that Christian religion depends on objective facts. There were defects in Neander's orthodoxy compared with his Lutheran forefathers; but his historical insight compelled him to see, as he said, that he lived in a period of disintegration rather than of construction, and that the danger was lest doctrines essential to the Christian religion should in the course of transition be thrown away. He was convinced that the Birth of Christ was not a result of the natural laws of human generation, but of a supernatural creative divine intervention. Also that the entire manifestation of Christ was supernatural; that His body after death was actually raised from the grave; that at His Ascension He passed to a higher state in a supernatural way. Neander held that the whole Figure of Christ represented in the Synoptic Gospels "exhibits a majesty far transcending human nature." All this convinced belief on the part of a Protestant was a contrast to the teaching in the Protestant Faculty at Tübingen, where at that time Strauss prevailed. Moreover, the Professor of History in Berlin was a man impressive for depth of reverence and personal experience in religion.

Möhler felt the attractiveness of all this. And when he attended Neander's lectures he was thrilled. What instruction Möhler himself had received in the history of the primitive Church while being trained for the priesthood is not made clear. But what he heard from this distinguished professor was a course of lectures on the early Christian centuries, on the Fathers of the Faith, the life and character of its outstanding personalities, their ideas and their aspirations, their principles and their practices, and all this pictured with a freshness and warm appreciation of their value, both surprising and impressive. Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustine, and Bernard were all represented with astonishing vividness, displayed in the strength of their faith and the definiteness of their convictions, before the young priest, who frankly confesses himself to have been at the time in a state of indecision.

And so the Protestant historian at Berlin, quite unconsciously, became the means of revealing to Möhler the real character and strength of the Catholic religion, with whose ministry he had been entrusted. It was a crisis in Möhler's career. "My residence in Berlin," he wrote, "must be considered the most decisive and the most important period in my life." Those lectures were, he says, "an unforgettable memory. They exerted a decisive effect on my labours in ecclesiastical history." They supplied what had been evidently lacking in his training as a priest. He returned to Tübingen, where he became a professor, resolved to devote himself to the study of the Fathers of the Church.

He still advocated in Catholicism various reforms. Communion in both kinds, and liturgy in the language of the people, found in him an ardent defender. He became one of the editorial staff of the *Tübingen Quarterly Review*, and contributed important articles, afterwards reprinted, on St. Anselm and on the religious life. All through those studious years he was living in the age of the Fathers, in their constant companionship. Then, in 1825, he published his book on the unity of the Church, or the principles of Catholicism according to the Fathers of the first three centuries.

It is extraordinarily fresh and enthusiastic, revealing at every page the powerful effect which his study of the Fathers had produced on a singularly keen and eager mind. Most characteristic of the Age of the Fathers was their conception of the Church: their consciousness that the Spirit did not withdraw from the Church when the Apostles died; their keen realization of the Corporate life; the substantial unity of their teaching. Tradition expressed the influence of the Spirit guiding the Community of the Faithful. The interpretation of the Scripture was made by minds already subject to the educational influence of the Church. To oppose Scripture against Tradition is a false antithesis. Where the Fathers differ in their interpretation of the Scriptures, their judgments have just the value of the individual's insight and capacity. Where they are agreed, their interpretation is a synonym for Tradition. No individual teacher can impose his personal opinions on the body of the faithful. No doctor has been more influential than St. Augustine: but the Church has not authorized his doctrine of Original Sin. Möhler illustrates the various spheres of unity: unity in the multitude of the faithful, unity in the Bishop, unity in the Episcopate, and, finally, unity in the Primacy. It is in this last that Möhler confesses that he has had misgivings. For a long time he says it had appeared to him uncertain whether the Primacy of one of the Churches

formed part of the distinctive characteristics of the Catholic Church. He had even been disposed to deny it. And that for two reasons: one because the unity of the Church appeared sufficiently realized in the collective Episcopate; the other because the evidence of the first three centuries was too poor to be capable of effectively excluding doubt. The final development and the clear conception of the Primacy belongs to a period later than that with which the writer deals. It can scarcely be wondered that this section of Möhler's work was not considered adequate within the Roman Church. This work of Möhler on unity in the Church has been translated into French by Dom Lilienfeld, O.S.B., in the present year, to commemorate the centenary.

Seven years after his Essay on Unity, Möhler produced his celebrated work entitled *Symbolism*: an exposition of the doctrinal differences between Catholicism and Protestantism, as shewn by their symbolical writings. In other words, by their respective official declarations. It is far more measured and balanced than the earlier work. The author had attained maturity.

The section of Möhler's *Symbolism* that attracted most attention was the contrast between the Catholic and the Protestant conception of the Church. To the former the Church is a visible community of believers founded by Christ. It is entrusted with the redemption and sanctification of mankind. It is, in principle, an extension of the Incarnation. Since the Word became flesh, the inward is manifested through the outward, the Divine through the Church. Into the Church the individual is incorporated. Hence the love and reverence and devotion which the Church deserves.

Here Möhler pauses to face the contrast between the heavenly and the earthly side of this sacred institution. There has been much evil in the Church. Nay, the evil has seemed at times to exceed the good. But the evil in the Church cannot impair the reverence due to the Institution of Christ. No man may reject the ideal on the ground that it is imperfectly represented. The Church is the training-place of the sinful. Its priests and bishops do not fall from the skies. The Church can only take its clergy out of the material that the age provides. "Doubtless, examples enough can be alleged of priests, bishops, and popes who in the most unconscionable and unjustifiable manner have failed to discharge their duty, when it was quite in their power to bring about a reform of morals; or who, by their own scandalous conduct and lives, have extinguished the still glimmering torch, which they ought to have kindled." Möhler insists that Catholics have not shrunk, and

must not shrink, from avowals of this kind. Indeed, Möhler regards Protestantism itself as the most conclusive proof of the state of neglect into which Catholics had fallen in the fifteenth century. Never would a system of doctrine like theirs have sprung up, error could never have so extensively prevailed, if the leaders of the Church had been faithful to their mission. Therefore, the Catholic Church, and the separated Communions alike, must make the sorrowful admission that all have been found wanting. "This is the point," said Möhler, "at which Catholics and Protestants will, in great multitudes, one day meet, and stretch a friendly hand one to the other." He fervently trusted that this open confession of mutual guilt will be followed by the festival of reconciliation.

Möhler puts out all his strength in this exposition of the nature of the Church and its relation to the Scriptures. The Church is the Christian religion made objective, the living embodiment of the Faith, invested with an outward form. Whereas, in reply to the question, how is the individual to arrive at certain knowledge about Jesus Christ? the Protestant answer is, through the Holy Scripture, the Catholic answer is, through the Church, which alone gives him understanding of the Scriptures. Undoubtedly the Scripture contains Divine communications, and therefore contains the pure Truth. But does it follow that our individual insight has ascertained the Truth? It is the Church to which the interpretation of the Scriptures is committed. In matters of Faith it is the Church which is the judge. There is a perpetual universal belief.

Möhler's *Symbolism* produced an immense impression in Germany as soon as it appeared. It is not usual for crowned heads to give emphatic expression to their disapproval of a treatise in theology. But Frederick William III. of Prussia declared himself prepared to reward worthily an adequate refutation of Möhler's *Symbolism*. It does not appear that the reward was given. But the fact that the offer was made illustrates the royal consciousness of the stir which the work was making.

If the importance of a book can be judged by the eminence of its opponents the *Symbolism* holds a remarkable position of its own. Five distinguished leaders of German Protestant thought expressed their opinion of its value.

The orthodox Evangelical Neander delivered with his usual gentleness a course of lectures about it in Berlin. But since he held that the idea of an invisible Church was necessarily involved in the very essence of Christianity, and that this invisible Church made its appearance in a multitude of various outward forms, his conclusion was that the Christian must

believe in the invisible Church, and not identify appearances with realities. The impossibility of finding any common standpoint between this conception of the Church's nature and that of Möhler is, of course, self-evident. But, as Neander's lectures, although delivered during Möhler's life, were not published until some thirty years after his death, they only enter very indirectly into the course of the controversy.

The Evangelical theologian Nitzsch declared that Möhler's *Symbolism* left him doubtful whether to be more astonished at its unhistorical character or at its artificiality. He devoted nearly 200 pages of the great *Journal Studien und Kritiken* for 1834 to a critical examination of its contents. His most effective complaint was that Möhler, in his criticism on Lutheranism, had not confined attention to official documents, such as the Augsburg Confession, which alone possess representative authority, but had brought in Luther's private letters, which were written before the Augsburg Confession appeared.

The most important reply was that from the pen of Ferdinand Christian Baur. Baur, being in the Protestant Faculty at Tübingen, was well aware of the importance of his colleague Möhler in the Catholic Faculty of the same centre of learning. He wrote an elaborate, detailed reply extending to more than 700 pages. The most important section was concerned with the nature of the Church. But the effectiveness of Baur's reply was largely neutralised by the negative standpoint which he ultimately adopted. Möhler felt the force of his objections, and was bound to answer them.

Somewhat later (in 1848), Marheineke gave a course of professorial lectures in Berlin, in which he represented Möhler's work as an exhibition of artful reasonings and detestable insinuations, which had in a brief time attained its fifth edition. But he acknowledged its author's learning and ability.

Finally, in Berlin, Schleiermacher pronounced that Möhler's work was the most formidable criticism of Protestantism that had appeared in Luther's Fatherland.

Möhler's influence extended far beyond Germany. The *Symbolism* was translated into French in 1836, and has been the theme of frequent comment both in Catholic and Protestant circles. "Tell him to take care of my French translation of Möhler's *Symbolism*," wrote Faber in 1841. "There is a wealth of glorious divinity in that book." Möhler's relation to the Catholic School of Tübingen was made the subject of an elaborate volume by the Alsatian Professor Edmond Vermeil.

It was translated into English in 1843 by J. B. Robertson, and exerted considerable influence through the Oxford Move-

ment, being strongly commended to the attention of Anglicans by leaders in the Catholic Revival. Gladstone read it in 1845, and in correspondence with Döllinger declared himself greatly and favourably impressed. Döllinger replied that in Catholic Germany Möhler's *Symbolism* had the authority of a classic, and that he himself was not aware of any other volume which was dominating German Catholic theology to the same degree. All the younger generation of their clergy had derived dogmatic ideas out of this book. Döllinger did not think that they would be satisfied with Baur's reply, for this same man who was here defending the older Lutheranism against Möhler was elsewhere attacking the canon of the New Testament and pronouncing its documents, to a large extent, either not genuine or else interpolated.*

Meanwhile, in very different surroundings, Cardinal Wiseman† read Möhler's book, and in his well-known letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury called the attention of Irish Catholics to the frankness with which this distinguished theologian in France had spoken of defects on the Roman side. Wiseman quoted with warm approval Möhler's reminder that the very existence of Protestantism is a testimony to the corruption of the Church in past ages, and uttered an emphatic warning to his own people that it was the duty of those in communion with the Apostolic See to bemoan and reform local abuses and corruptions.*

Möhler's rapidly increasing reputation led to an imperial appointment to a professorship at Munich: a far more congenial position than Tübingen had been. But his studiousness had overtaxed his strength. His temperament, highly strung, was not conducive to length of days. He wore himself out. His early death at the age of forty-two was an irreparable loss to his people. Döllinger gathered together Möhler's stray studies, and published them in memory of him. His work still lives, and seems especially valued in France. The eminent French historical critic, Goyou, has done much to popularize it in a volume of his *L'Allemagne Religieuse*, and in a valuable volume on Möhler's writings, in the series of Texts and Studies in Christian Thought.

Some twenty years after Möhler's death his old opponent Baur published a history of the Church in the nineteenth century, and there recorded his final estimate of Möhler's work. He held that as an indication of the changed outlook characteristic of that time, a first place must be assigned

* *Friedrich Ignaz von Dollinger*, ii. 224.

† Letter on Catholic Unity, addressed to the Earl of Shrewsbury, by Nicholas, Bishop of Melipotamus, 1841, p. 33.

* *Life of Cardinal Wiseman*, by Wilfred Ward, i. 404.

to the author of the book on Symbolism. No Catholic theologian of that period was so familiar with Protestant literature, and so qualified as Möhler, to adapt to his own standpoint modern elements derived from Schleiermacher's theology. Möhler's *Symbolism* was a work which could only have been produced in Germany, under the dominant influence of German Protestant erudition. Baur declared that the impression made by the book upon himself was that in its author's opinion the difference between Catholicism and Protestantism was the contrast between Truth and Falsehood; an opinion of which the extravagance was its own refutation. At the same time he recognized that to the Catholic theologian Dogma is something given, something universal. Protestantism, on the contrary, was individualist. And this distinction between the individual and the universal was only possible on the principles of Catholicism. Baur quoted the opinion of Strauss that where the alternative lies between the principle of individualism and that of authority, the question whether authority resides in the Bible or in the Church becomes a matter of purely subordinate interest. Baur himself maintained that the essence of Protestantism consisted in the freedom of the individual, and that the Reformers were not clear-minded enough to realize the implications of their own accepted principle. Their conferences, ending in formulas and concordats, were in reality limitations of the individual freedom which their own principle demanded. What were the effects of unrestricted individualism on the contents of the Christian religion Baur was not here concerned to display. He drew them out for himself elsewhere.

The fine tribute of admiration for Möhler's ability and character pronounced years ago by Lichtenberger, Dean of the Protestant Faculty in Paris, is a notable example of the extent to which the Professor at Munich attracted thoughtful men outside his own Communion. To Lichtenberger's mind "Möhler is one of the noblest and most sympathetic individuals which the German Catholic Church has produced. Uniting great moral elevation with rare subtlety and delicacy of feeling, to a clear, exact intellect, and sincere piety, he presented in his character that harmonious mixture of breadth and strength which produces so favourable an impression, and draws forth confidence and esteem."

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

MISCELLANEA

THE PLACE OF THE CROSS IN THE WORLD

THERE are two extreme views as to the destiny of the world. The optimist looks upon all things as working towards the highest good; the pessimist regards them as tending to the utmost evil. There is one thing in common between these two extremes; neither can deny the presence of the sacrificial element in the world. The difference between the two arises from the different positions they assign to the sacrificial element. The pessimist looks upon the cross as the only goal of life. The optimist, on the other hand, regarding the *summum bonum* as individual happiness, thinks of the cross rather as an unessential, though painful, interlude. In so far as suffering is recognized as being of the warp and woof of life in the world pessimism is metaphysically right. All purely optimistic metaphysical systems are superficial. And yet it should be recognized that our attitude to life is not determined by the fact that all life is bound up with pain and suffering. Pessimism does not do justice to experience, for the majority of people know that life is pain, but at the same time welcome and accept life. Christianity occupies neither the optimistic nor the pessimistic position. It reaches its distinctive philosophy by combining both elements in one. It asserts that all things work together for good, and at the same time agrees that things as they are now constituted bring home to men their impotence. These two apparently contradictory statements are reconciled in the Christian proclamation that the highest good is to be found in *sacrifice*. The greatest happiness that can come to an individual is simply his realization of not being able to find happiness in himself. In the sacrifice of the individual man there emerges his greatest joy.

In this respect the writer of the Apocalypse comes nearer to a philosophy of history than all who went before him. The Apocalypse has been called a sensuous book. And it is true that we have the crystal fountain and the clear river, the pearly gates and the trees with luscious fruit. Yet none of these joys can be called distinctive joys of the soul. The very joys of the New Jerusalem are joys which spring from the sacrificial element. If the saints hunger no more, it is not because they are surfeited with plenty; it is because the Lamb in the midst of the throne has led them, because in the power of self-forgetfulness their own burden has dropped in the sea.

According to this writer there is one thing which leads progressively to happiness. It is not the intellect, nor the imagination, but altruism, the inability of the individual to live for his own interests. "The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the earth." This was not the result of an accident; it was not the result of an emergency; it was something involved in the plan of creation. Sacrifice is bound up with the constitution of nature, and progress in the power to sacrifice is progress in the life of nature. Unhappiness is always the result of some obstacle, a derangement from the line of march, whereas to be on the *line* of things in the world is the way to attain ultimate happiness. St. John teaches that creation is moving towards a type—a Lamb slain—and it is moving

towards that type along the line of sacrifice. It is climbing towards its goal by increasing limitations of the self-life. This means that the individual as at present constituted is cribbed and cabined through self-interest. It is a philosophy which points to a greater ideal than the family. It destroys the boundaries of the nation, because it stimulates man to a wider altruism than even the life of the patriot—an altruism which finds a place in its heart for every country and people and kindred and tongue. This is the perfect sacrificial life which will be found in the New Jerusalem.

Now pain and sacrifice have always been associated together. The greatest saints have generally been regarded as the men who have borne most marks of suffering and exhibited most traces of self-denial. Men have gone into the deserts, immolated themselves, lacerated themselves. Women have sacrificed the joys of family and home for Christ's sake. Kings have thrown away their crowns that they may sit in sackcloth and ashes. It would seem at first sight that the sacrificial life and pain are inextricably bound up with one another. Nicolas Berdyaef, in *The Destiny of Man*, thinks that suffering is closely connected with freedom and that it is only humanistic compassion that is inspired by the illusion that it is possible to free men from suffering altogether and give them happiness. Yet St. John takes it for granted that the aim of Christianity is the attainment of a happiness when "there shall be no more pain." Furthermore, the life of Christ is a sacrificial life, not only in this world, but in all worlds. Why is it then that Christianity, the religion which professes ultimately to abolish pain, should throughout the ages have linked the idea of sacrifice with the thought of pain? The importance of the answer to this question is apparent, for men can go through the most terrible sufferings if they see a meaning to them. Nietzsche said that it is not so much the suffering as the uselessness of it that is unendurable.

We find at least a suggestion of an answer in the Authorized Version of a passage in the Apocalypse. The passage reads: "Neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." That is to say, the passing away of previous things is made the reason for the passing away of pain. At present the need of pain is linked up with the constitution of nature because there are certain elements in life which make its existence desirable. Whenever these elements which make it desirable shall be either removed or transformed, it will lose its function, and therefore will cease to be. Now if sin be the constant and unscrupulous preference of one's self before the interest of others, then half the battle will be gained when the individual is shaken off his self-centre and moved to the service of others—that is, on to the line of sacrifice. As soon as the lowest nature has forgotten its own desires, even for a short time, and has lived for others, the grip of sin has been loosened and the work of grace has begun. And it would seem that there is no influence so potent for alluring one out of self as the appeal of pain. There is a redemptive purpose in pain which is not so much personal as altruistic.

Pity is the most certain and universal of man's feelings. More than anything else it creates a universal bond between man and man. Browning knew this:

> Mankind forsooth!
> Who sympathizes with their general joy
> Foolish as undeserved? But pain—see God's
> Wisdom at work! . . . .

That brings flesh
Triumphant from the bar whereto arraigned
Soul quakes with reason. In the eye of God
Pain may have a purpose and be justified,
Man's sense avails only to see, in pain,
A hateful chance no man but would avert
Or, failing, needs must pity.

What kindred cannot do, what race cannot do, what identity of taste cannot do, what even common joy cannot do, is achieved in a moment from the lowest ground. Sympathy with pain is the widest sympathy in the world. It is at present the only chain that constitutes the common brotherhood of man. When brought face to face with suffering every sin—pride, vanity, envy—is suspended; every virtue—love, sacrifice, gentleness, humility—is called into exercise. People of every creed and no creed meet round suffering and are nearer to one another and to goodness than at any other time in their lives.

This redemptive power of suffering has its chief illustration in Christ. It goes without saying that Jesus is the spring of salvation. This salvation is due to the Cross. Whatever views we hold on the Atonement, there is one thing about which all Christians are agreed, and that is that it is not a white marble Christ that touches the human heart, nor loosens the bands of sin. It is Jesus Crucified, in the unutterable pathos of His Passion and Death, who has overcome and gotten unto Himself the victory. From age to age the shadow of sin hangs heavy upon life, but ever the crucifix faces men, and they are drawn to His feet and goodness by the invitation of the pierced hands. There is much more in the Death of Christ than this, but His sufferings in the sacrifice have at least this redemptive value.

This association of pain with the breaking down of self-interest and the building up of the sacrificial life seems to us much more satisfactory an explanation of its presence in the world than many other explanations which have been given. Some of these explanations are ethical but partial in their operation, as, for instance, invalidism, which purifies one person and hardens another; others are universal but not ethical, as, for instance, the action of hunger. In arousing a sympathy which affects men generally and ethically we seem to see a Divine purpose in pain. When men are no longer self-centred, when the stimulus for the sacrificial life will be found in joy, and the limitations of the heart will have yielded to the universal power of love, then pain with its function will disappear. When that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away.

E. Kenneth Lee.

A GERMAN CATHOLIC MANIFESTO

No one in England seems to have noticed the significance of an anonymous book on the dying and re-birth of Catholicism, published in 1937 (*Der Katholizismus : sein Stirb und Werde*, Herausgegeben von G. Mensching, J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, München, RM. 4.50). The authors are a group of Catholic priests and laymen, who withhold their names, not because they are afraid to face the music but in order that the ideas presented may be considered without the disturbing influence of possible personal animosities.

Much use is made of quotations from Catholic writers, which proves that the group represents a considerable body of opinion. The general purpose is to extricate the kernel from the shell, things of eternal value from the temporal form in which they have come down to us. The famous apologists of today—Adam, Guardini, Przywara, etc.—do not meet the needs of the time. Outwardly they may be modern, but their approach is just that scholastic-dogmatic one which is outmoded. The greatest challenge of all comes from Asia, where India, for example, wants no Hellenized, Romanized, or Europeanized Christianity, but the pure Christianity of the New Testament (p. 30). How familiar it sounds, but how curious from the pens of Roman Catholics!

After an Introduction follows Part I, "Pulling Down." The writers are largely influenced by Heiler, who they say has given the only scientific account of Catholicism; only he has known it from within, gone out and surveyed it from a distance, and yet maintained sympathy with what he has left. The dominant motive of the system is to maintain what is, which means in effect clericalism. The heaviest guns are brought to bear on the scholastic philosophy. Aristotle's fundamental error lies in his basing spiritual being on the analogy of nature and thus misconceiving its characteristic essence. Religion springs mainly from the prophetic and mystic types, for whom the systematizers cannot legislate. Religion must be conceived of in terms of life, not of theory.

Biblical criticism shews us plainly that Jesus belonged to the prophetic type and was essentially a layman, and that His mind was permeated with eschatology. He could not have founded the hierarchical Church. A root fault in the Catholic system is that it has prescribed the conclusions and thereby made scientific proof of the fact of revelation impossible. It argues in a circle. What should attest belief is made dependent on belief. Purely intellectual things are made the subject of moral and religious obligation.

Catholic *Wissenschaft* is inadequate to its task. In wide fields of theology we have to depend, in our fight against unbelief, on the writings of Protestants. Yet it is we who rely on *Wissenschaft*, with which the Protestants, insisting on religious experience, can dispense. Never has German Catholicism been so weak in ideas as during the post-War years when it won its great outward successes.

We come to Part II, "Building Up," and find some remarkable judgments on Protestantism, which is a necessary protest against the externalizing of religion and the absolutizing of the merely relative. "Protestantism as a spiritual attitude belongs as much to the essence of religion as does the tendency to externalisation, that is Catholicism" (p. 105). But actual Protestantism has broken the vessels which preserve the divine treasure and thereby lost their contents. This explains its amazing extremes, dialectical theology with its despair of civilization succeeding to liberalism and in its turn provoking the reaction of the "German Christians."

The writers repudiate Modernism with its catchwords (as represented in the Papal Encyclical) of Agnosticism, Immanentism, Symbolism, and Evolution. We cannot follow them closely through this section. It will be enough to mark their criticism of the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*; their doubts as to the liturgical movement, which demands a Platonic realism in the worshippers and thereby lays a heavy burden on many

modern men; and their remarks about the Parousia. "What could a final catastrophe on the earthly plane—what could such a natural phenomenon have to do with the essence of the Christian faith ?" (p. 189).

Finally we reach the demands of the new time. Christianity is not bound up with Blood and Soil; nor is it international, like Freemasonry and Marxism. Rather it is super-national. It is not antagonistic to nationhood (*Volkstum*), which needs it lest it fall back into the brutal. Herr Hitler's teaching directly contradicts Hegel's view that men reach spiritual reality only through the State.

The practical reforms demanded are the use of the mother-tongue in church, especially at the Eucharist, except for the Canon; the revival of preaching; the development of genuine German singing of the chorale type (not plainsong); a shortened Bible; and above all a different attitude towards the laity, who are to be regarded as spiritually grown up, not merely as "objects of pastoral care." The problems of ethics will have to be left mainly to the Catholic laity.

Most surprising is the passionate attack on clerical celibacy, as a piece of compulsory church law—voluntary celibacy is honoured. The theology of it is all wrong. To desert human loves for the love of God is an impossible ideal: how can we love the transcendent God, apart from the symbols and representations of Him on earth ? Heroism is attainable in every walk of life, married as well as celibate. The married man of small means with children leads a more disciplined and heroic life than the celibate parish priest. His life is a continuous round of small sacrifices, of comfort, quiet, etc.—he can't even have his bath when he wants to ! But the gravest indictment is against the system which fixes the obligation of celibacy on young men, in practice on lads in their teens, at an age when they cannot know whether God has called them to a normal married life, so that they cannot escape from it without the reproach of apostasy.

My only comment is that the whole outlook is so essentially Anglican that I wonder whether I should welcome a Reformation on these lines. Would not Rome lose that which differentiates her from us and makes her example so precious ?

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

"AND LEAD US NOT INTO TEMPTATION"

There are very many people who find great difficulty in the intelligent offering of this petition, not in spite of its being part of our Lord's supreme pattern prayer, but precisely because of that. For, they say, if it be true, as we believe, that God cannot tempt any man to do evil, why should Jesus, above all people, have taught us to ask that He will not lead us into direct temptations to sin ? They have heard, on the one hand, the suggestion that in this place temptation is used in its connotation of trial or probation, and they are not satisfied, for why, especially if probation be for the strengthening of our character, should we desire that the reality of our Christian profession should never be tested in any degree ? On the other hand, they have heard the explanation that temptation does not come from God Himself, but from "the world, the

flesh and the devil," that God merely allows it, and that we are praying Him to exercise some restraining influence on its severity. Neither does this satisfy, for it fails to take account of God's active guidance implied in the petition.

A further suggestion often made to enquirers is that with their thoughts about this prayer they should couple the assertion of St. Paul that God will not allow any to be tempted beyond his powers of resistance, " but will with the temptation also make a way to escape " that he may be able to bear it. This is open to the same objection that it does not give full force to the words " lead . . . into," which imply God's positive guidance of the individual into circumstances which are in fact a direct inducement to sin. If He indeed does this, is it strictly true to say that He is not in reality tempting the individual to evil ?

This note does not pretend to give a complete answer to the difficulty, but, following a suggestion made by St. Thomas Aquinas in his commentary on the Lord's Prayer, to indicate a possible line of enquiry. St. Thomas says that because of man's sins God withdraws His grace which would otherwise have enabled man to resist the temptations which are permitted to assail him, and therefore may be said to lead man into temptation. Yet this explanation, as it stands, suggests not so much leading as passive contemplation, and, moreover, it raises an additional doubt whether we can use the prayer at all after a good confession has restored us to a state of grace. An explanation is needed which will give full force to the positive aspect of the clause.

In addition to the withdrawal of grace on the part of God, another effect of sin upon the individual is the weakening of character and of what may be called the natural powers of resistance, so that conditions which in normal circumstances would have presented little or no difficulty may, as a result of constant yielding to some sin, become a very serious source of temptation. God has a plan for each one of us; that is what we mean by vocation; and when He sets us on the road towards the accomplishment of this plan, He undoubtedly gives us the powers needful to that end. He then actively leads the individual into the circumstances which are necessary for the fulfilment of the vocation to which he is called; and whether or not those circumstances are an incitement to sin depends then largely on the individual, whether he co-operates fully with God.

Let us take an example. A priest or welfare worker may have to go into all kinds of places where occasions of sin abound. His vocation demands that he shall be in close contact with sinners and with sin in many forms. God indeed leads him into these places in the course of his ministry, and, we believe, gives him the necessary power to preserve himself unspotted, by close co-operation with His grace. But if in earlier life this same worker has contracted sinful habits of a kind which he is now called upon to combat, his own powers of resistance being considerably weakened thereby, these conditions which would otherwise have exerted little influence over him are now in very truth sources of grievous temptation; and God has led him to them.

This aspect of the case seems to resolve the prayer into a request not merely that God will bestow more abundant grace to enable us to resist temptations which He permits to come to us from other sources, but also that He will counter the effects of our own wilfulness, that He will make up for the deteriorating effects of our sin by so changing the

conditions under which our vocation is to be realized that He leads us, not in the path where He originally intended, but where with our weakened character it is now safe for us to go. That is to say, we ask that He will override our rebellion against His immediate will that His ultimate intention may prevail.

This attempted explanation is not entirely satisfactory, but it does at least take some account of that which is a cause of perplexity to so many, that in the prayer we assume that conditions which are an active source of temptation are those into which God, of set purpose, has deliberately led His children. H. R. Wilson.

MODERNIST CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

(A Reply by an Architect to "Two Priests")

The foundations of church building are financial, and if "Two Priests" came to an architect for advice as to the building of a church, the question would be the Pie-man's, "Shew me first your penny."

Can we consider Gothic architecture at all? Gothic architecture, an architecture of stone, of stone tracery and stone vaults, is today fabulously expensive. The "just as good" substitutes fail in the essential quality of a church, sincerity and consistency. Brick with stone dressings is seldom satisfactory and the loss is greater than the economy, and the economy is made only the more obvious. An entirely brick church, however, makes no pretensions and unfetters the architect from stylistic conventions. The words pretentious and conventional are ill terms, if applicable to a Christian church.

Concrete, if not a cheap material, is relatively inexpensive for the purpose of vaulting and has the quality of permanence. It is capable of taking innumerable beautiful forms, and of covering wide spans without intermediate supports. Its æsthetic possibilities are quite unexplored, while the Gothic vault reached its climax and its end in the fifteenth century. To place a religious taboo on this material is as irrational as it is untraditional. Gothic architecture was an architecture of adventure, and a concrete vault is next in succession to St. George's, Windsor.

Honest brickwork is a material we can afford; the manufacture of bricks has been carried to a fine art. Every shade, texture, and size of brick is to be had, and while there is traditional brickwork in England the Tudor period passed into the Renaissance before the characteristic forms of brick building were explored. Here again are all kinds of lovely possibilities inherent in the material awaiting development.

Actually, next to finance in our thoughts comes plan, the means and the end to be achieved. Material is the third consideration. It is in the direction of plan that our new materials give us the greatest emancipation. The mediæval parish church is conditioned in every direction by the materials available; the division into nave and aisles is an expedient for roofing the whole width with beams limited in length. Though one may and should be a devoted admirer of such of our parish churches as have escaped the Victorians, one will still be sympathetic with the unfortunate people in the aisles, who crane their necks to catch a glimpse

of the altar and the pulpit between the pillars of the arcade. The altar position, at the end of a deep chancel, arose from monastic arrangement, and the place of the monks is taken by irreverent little monkeys, whose voices, intended to lead the singing, seldom emerge from the chancel arch. The chancel screen no longer serves its original purpose, that of keeping the chancel free from defilement by straying dogs, and serves only to render the services more remote from the congregation. If it is desired that services should be communal and that the whole gathering should participate in one oblation, such planning is entirely obsolete. Our new methods render it entirely unnecessary.

It was a pity that " Two Priests " did not pursue more seriously the analogy between literature and architecture. A true analogy can be made, since both are concerned in the expression of ideas. To substitute " Says you " for " Amen " is no advance, but preaching might well advance by becoming more coherent and logical and more sympathetic towards the congregation, in the way that modern architecture approaches its task. One cannot defend all modernist church architecture, and the movement, like many another, is liable to be discredited by its extremists. One can, however, buy modern pictures that are not surrealist, strange, disturbing and ambiguous, and one can commission modern churches that, while alive and fresh, are familiar, calm, and quite plainly churches.

As to the devotional atmosphere, this is quite independent of both modes and materials, and is the outcome of various virtues, such as simplicity and sincerity. It is the peculiar contribution of an architect who is not only a competent designer but a religious man.

There can be little question that mock Gothic is antagonistic to the modern mind, and that Victorian shams are calculated to offend the intelligent youth of today. It is a fact that they do not come to church, and is not the cause, perhaps, that they find its atmosphere not devotional, but hostile and redolent of the sentimentality and unreality of an age from which they have emancipated themselves ?

What " Two Priests " love in genuine Gothic architecture is the spirit behind it. It is the business of us all to shew them that this spirit has not departed, and to express it in forms that have no unfortunate associations.

T. Lawrence Dale, F.R.I.B.A.

THE DIACONATE

Dr. Prideaux's article in the October issue professes to carry the ordinand no further than his immediate objective: it may be useful to consider him in the first year of his ministry.

The very inadequate professional training given to the would-be priest, inadequate at least in quantity, though not nowadays in quality, can be justified only on the ground that the ordinand is only continuing his pastoral theological and ministerial training in a new *milieu* and under a new principal. The two, or at the most three, years spent in a theological college contrast ill with the far longer periods demanded not only by the heads of other professions, but by the authorities of the Roman and Free Churches. In the last instance, however, the newly ordained minister generally takes up a position of responsibility analogous to that

of the incumbent, for which, no doubt, his longer training adequately equips him, but the deacon has to serve an apprenticeship of two years during which, ideally, his training is continued, so that he may be said to have not three but five years of ministerial preparation.

"Ideally" because it is still possible for the definite training virtually to cease. Gone are the days when the deacon was sent to a parish where the incumbent was non-resident and the hapless youth had to pick up his craft as he went along, and arrange exchanges with compassionate incumbents so that his flock should not be utterly destitute of eucharistic privileges. Nevertheless deacons are still occasionally sent to the wrong incumbents. When a much respected and beloved bishop says to the man whom he is to ordain on the morrow, "I am sending you to the most difficult man in my diocese"—the remark was repeated to the writer by the deacon in question, and he has no reason to doubt its substantial accuracy—the obvious comments to make are: (*a*) The bishop should not have made the remark, and (*b*) he should not have allowed the deacon to go to that particular parish. It may be worth while to enumerate a few of the qualifications necessary for the incumbent who is prepared to "offer a title."

I. He should be what the Latin grammar calls "junior," that is, "young rather than old." That there are priests who look back with the deepest gratitude to the training they received from a sexagenarian or even septuagenarian incumbent does not prevent the soundness of the general rule just enunciated. Some men age more rapidly than others, and some never seem to age at all, yet as a rule the older a man is the harder he finds it to use the spectacles of the young. "Remember now thyself in the days of thy youth" is a counsel that the middle-aged need, and need more and more as the years go over their heads. It is easy to forget the outlook of a young man, his difficulties, his temptations, and, it may be added, his virtues. Dr. Liddon once used the story of the old and the young prophets to illustrate the deadening effect that the contented complacency of middle-age can have on the fresh and not as yet disillusioned enthusiasm of youth. Moreover, the younger a man is the less he will be wedded to old methods and old ideas, and the more will he be willing to learn the newer outlook and the more recent technique from one who has just been taught the rudiments of it. There are faults of which the young man will be guilty just because he is a young man, faults which he will soon outgrow, but which need very sympathetic handling.

II. It will be as well if the incumbent and the deacon see more or less eye to eye on matters ecclesiastical. It may be a good discipline for a young man to have to put up with six candles when he thinks that two is the right number, or *vice versa*, yet it may be purchased at too high a price. The complaint is occasionally made by young Anglo-Catholics that it is hard to get a title in a parish, the use of which is wholly congenial to them. They say they are met with the rebuff of "uselessness": it must be a priest or no one. Sympathy cannot be withheld from the hard-worked incumbent who foresees that he will have to say every mass in the parish for a whole year! Even if he never has anything worse than a cold he can never get that occasional "lie in" that is of such untold benefit to the hard worker. Yet on the other hand the young deacon may have to look forward to spending two years in surroundings which are the reverse of pleasant to him, and just at that age when the power

to adapt himself to the faith and works of a different school of thought is undeveloped. It would be most unjust to imply that every Anglo-Catholic deacon is working in an uncongenial environment, yet there are instances to the contrary. Of the two evils, it is surely better that a man shall go to a theological college which is not quite of his own colour and then take a title with a like-minded incumbent, than that he shall revel in the teachings and uses of the college and then find himself with a man, however excellent and well-meaning, who cannot understand that the young deacon is made very unhappy by much that he has to hear and do—or leave undone.

III. The incumbent should, if possible, be able to help the young man to stick to his books and his sermon preparation. So far as circumstances permit he should be encouraged to be the student for the whole of five mornings in every week. The incumbent can help him with the books to be read for his next examination, and assist him to read round the subject. Indeed, he may go further and teach him, what so many of us were expected to know by the light of nature, how to " get up " a subject or a book. He can help him also with his sermons. It is commonly said that every deacon tries to compress all theology, or at least all the theology he knows, into every sermon. Tactfully the incumbent can shew the man how necessary it is to get *one* idea across, to select it, and then develop it as the musician develops his theme. All this takes time and trouble, and therefore it may be as well if the deacon does not go to some " key parish," the kind of place where the incumbent is likely to get some high preferment. Such a man is almost forced, however reluctant he may be, to be absent from his parish from time to time. He is, possibly, archdeacon: at least he is rural dean. He has to appear on various platforms, to serve on sundry committees, to preach here, to lecture there, to take a mission somewhere else. He has his competent staff who can " carry on " quite well in his unavoidable absences, but of his deacon he sees, it may be, but little. Once more let it be stated that this is by no means the invariable rule in these cases. Generalizations are always precarious. Yet there are those priests to whom it may be said, " You were trained under X, were you ? Lucky man !" and they have to reply, " Well, I can't say he did much for me."

IV. He must be an " encourager." Not that there is not some snubbing to do, some reproving, some sharp correcting, maybe. Yet where is the justice in being vocal in reproof and silent in appreciation ? Is it fair to blame the carelessness that broke the cup at the thousandth ablution and never praise 999 previous acts of carefulness ? Is it just to be " extreme to mark what is done amiss " and not to applaud zeal and pains and energy and devotion ? Better make the young man a little conceited with too many pats on the back than daunt him by an apparent ignoring of all his efforts to do his duty. He will need encouragement, too, for he will go out from the palace like a young Joshua, only to find many more Ais than Jerichos. He will have his hours of despondency, times when he feels he has accomplished nothing, times when he sorely needs the ravens or wandering Arabs (whichever it was) to bring him a few crumbs of comfort. The incumbent can also " pave the way ": the faithful can be bidden to pray for the young man, can be asked to meet and welcome him on his arrival, can be bidden to be themselves encouragers.

V. The deacon must, if possible, be given some outlet for initiative.

If he has it, it needs guidance; if he has it not, it must be developed. For the beneficed is left largely to himself, and has to have the power of leadership and initiative in a considerable degree if he is to be anything more than a mere dispenser of food, sacramental and homiletical. Here, then, is the young deacon: let him be given, if possible, something, however small, of his " very own," as the children say. Perhaps it is the Scouts, perhaps it is the choir: it may be this or it may be that, but let it be something at which, under constant direction, supervision and, above all, encouragement, the deacon can grow in the power of leading and controlling others.

Great, indeed, is the opportunity. Happy indeed is the priest who can look back with no other thoughts than those of abounding gratitude to his " first vicar." Yet it need not necessarily be a vicar at all. There are those who are ordained on the title of a fellowship or a post at a school. True, they diminish yearly. Indeed, the ordination lists render any discussion of these cases almost superfluous. Yet may there never be priests who look back with gratitude to their *dean*? Is there any insuperable barrier to prevent a young man with a good voice being ordained to a minor canonry? He cannot pronounce the absolution, but there will always be some priest with him; he cannot say mass, but it is not a difficulty to supply the altars at most cathedrals. Work can be found for him in the city. A cathedral can be a kind of Arabia for the young man, a place where he can have quiet hours in the library, quiet times in that side chapel set apart for devotion. He need not stay too long; he should be encouraged to go to some big industrial centre or to the mission field after two or three years. Yet may he not look back with gratitude all his life to the cathedral where he was ordained *and first ministered*, where the dean and canons were true fathers in God to him, where their wives took (so far as they could) the place of the mother whom he had rarely left before, where from the very first he heard only the best music sung, and every service begun punctually and rendered with scrupulous care and reverence? Perhaps there are difficulties in the way, but perhaps also it may be worth while to make an effort to overcome them.

R. S. T. Haslehurst.

CORRESPONDENCE

" WHAT IS MAN ?"

To the Editor of Theology.

I

Sir,

In the current number of Theology you print an article signed C. W. Bird, entitled " What is Man ?" in which the writer does me the honour of thrice referring to me, and on two occasions to a particular book of mine (though with no reference to page or chapter). In none of the three instances do the words apparently quoted bear the remotest resemblance to those of any passage that occurs in any book that I have published.

Clement C. J. Webb.

Old Rectory,
Pitchcott,
Nr. Aylesbury.
September 27, 1938.

II

DEAR SIR,

In reply to Dr. Webb's letter, I am sorry if my references to his books are in any way misleading, but, as the absence of quotation marks shews, I make no attempt to quote actual passages from his books.

The page references are as follows:

1. *Re* the Incarnation, the Son, as Man, as an essential part of the Divine Nature. *Problems in the Relations of God and Man*, p. 240 (the reference to the value of the Babe, as such, is already attributed to Mr. Kidd).

2. The self-authenticating nature of the Moral Law, and the experience of God. *Divine Personality and Human Life*, pp. 141, 111, 190, and *Problems in the Relations of God and Man*, p. 26.

3. Man as the vehicle of the Divine. *Problems*, pp. 134, 240.

Yours truly,

C. W. BIRD.

UPCOMBE,
WOODLAND WAY,
PURLEY.
October 13, 1938.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

ANALECTA BOLLANDIANA: TOMUS LVI., FASC. I. ET II.

NEARLY half the current number is taken up with an article entitled " La Legende de Ste Edith en Prose et Vers par le Moine Goscelin."

The monk Goscelin or Gotselin was brought over to England by Hermann, Bishop of Salisbury (1045-77), and was highly praised by William of Malmesbury for his Lives of the Saints. William says that he was " inferior to Bede alone in praising the saints of England." The Edith whose life is given in the article was the daughter of Eadgar, King of the English, the first king in whose coronation both Archbishops took part. In 961 Eadgar had taken from the cloister at Wilton a lady who wore the veil though not a professed nun, and by her he had a daughter. When the daughter was born Eadgar wished to marry the mother, but she refused and returned to Wilton, taking the child with her, and is said to have eventually become abbess. The daughter Edith was brought up at Wilton and early in life took the veil from Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester. Even when professed she would on occasion dress with great splendour and was once rebuked by Ethelwold for so doing. She reminded him that St. Augustine had said that pride could abide even in rags. She built a church at Wilton dedicated to St. Dionysius; she died in her twenty-third year, and was buried by St. Dunstan in this church. So many miracles were recorded at her tomb that Goscelin wrote her Life both in prose and verse. The article gives critical and exhaustive examination of the various MSS. of these Lives.

The number also contains the Life of Saint Eusebia or Vita, a contemporary of Thecla, the companion of St. Paul, now printed in its original form for the first time, and a discussion of the date of the martyrdom of St. Symeon, Archbishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon. The usual " Bulletin des Publications Hagiographiques " occupies nearly a hundred pages, in which as usual Irish works are well to the fore.

C. P. S. C.

REVIEWS

THE RIDDLE OF THE DIDACHE, FACT OR FICTION, HERESY OR CATHOLICISM. F. E. Vokes. S.P.C.K., 1938. 12s. 6d.

THE Didache has been a puzzle to students of Church History since its publication in 1883. Opinions of a very definite nature have been expressed concerning it, which perhaps because of their precision have only served to prevent a clearer understanding of this curious document. Both Bryennios, the discoverer and first editor, and Harnack, in his edition of 1884, perceived the influence of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas and for this reason suggested a date between 140 and 160 A.D. In 1886 Dr. Charles Taylor called attention to a number of rabbinical parallels and from them drew the conclusion of an early date " when Christianity had just separated itself from the parent stem of Judaism."* Harnack thereupon revised his opinion in favour of the early date which was adopted by many others, and the Didache came to be regarded as offering valuable material in reconstructing a picture of the worship and organization of the primitive Church.

A theory that the first part of the Didache, called from its opening words " The Two Ways," had formed originally a Jewish manual for the use of proselytes found favour in many quarters. No one, however, was able to discover traces of any such Jewish Catechism, which would probably not have been thought of apart from the Didache. It is, moreover, not easy to see of what value so slender a document would have been, had it ever existed, in view of the care taken over the preparation of proselytes in their instruction in the Torah and their admission to the Jewish fold.† This manual of " The Two Ways " was supposed to have circulated separately and to have been used by Barnabas as well as by the author of the Didache. The section i. 3*b*–ii. 1, which contained references to the Sermon on the Mount and the Shepherd of Hermas, was regarded as a Christian interpolation. This part of the theory obtained support from the absence of the section from the Latin Version and some other authorities. The Latin Version is now known

* *The Teaching of the Apostles*, by C. Taylor, D.D., 1886, p. 118.

† The requirements before admission were circumcision, baptism and sacrifice (*Sifre Numb*, § 108). The proselyte took upon himself all the law without qualification (Galatians v. 3), an obligation which he renewed when he said the Shema (*M. Berakoth*, ii. 2).

to be not a version at all, but an extract made for the purposes of a homily, and the witnesses today in favour of the "interpolation" are known to be five.*

The late Dr. J. A. Robinson, in his Donnellan Lectures delivered in 1920, brought the study of the Didache to a new and interesting stage. He treated it, to use Dom R. H. Connolly's phrase, as "a synoptic problem." He demonstrated with great clearness from a careful examination of the texts that the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas, a rabbinically minded Christian, is the author of "The Two Ways," that the Didachist (Dr. Robinson's useful term) knew and used Hermas, and that he helped himself generously to the Epistle of Barnabas, arranging the material he selected in an orderly fashion after the manner of a careful and methodical compiler. Dr. Robinson, too, has shewn us that the Didachist's editorial pen is sometimes fantastic and on occasion is flourished in a rather feeble attempt at originality. His mind, moreover, is stored with scriptural phrases which are evidently quoted from memory, and which are sometimes given a meaning contrary to that which they were intended to convey.

The conclusions of Dr. J. A. Robinson have recently been supported by Dr. James Muilenburg, who, after an independent study of the documents, has become thoroughly convinced of the unity of Barnabas and of the dependence of the Didache upon Barnabas. The steps by which he has come to these conclusions are set out convincingly and with great clearness in his valuable essay *The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*.† Dr. Muilenburg has no belief in a hypothetical Jewish manual for proselytes, which would find few defenders today.

The latest contribution to this interesting study is a volume from the pen of a young scholar, the Rev. F. E. Vokes, published with the arresting title *The Riddle of the Didache, Fact or Fiction, Heresy or Catholicism?* It is a thorough and useful examination of the field up to the present time. After some carefully written chapters on the text and the literary history of the Didache Mr. Vokes proceeds to the consideration of matters of a debatable character, with a sureness of touch and a grasp of material which inspire confidence. The book is one to be welcomed, and one which deserves very careful examination. The author seems to be on sure ground in his acceptance of much of the work of Doctors Robinson and Muilenburg, and in the late date to which he ascribes the Didache—the end of

* Note by Dom R. H. Connolly, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xxxv., p. 115.

† This essay is not easy to obtain owing to its having been printed privately in Germany. It appeared in 1929. No student of the Didache can afford to miss it.

the second or the beginning of the third century. To the mind of the present reviewer he greatly underestimates the Jewish character of the work, and is a little too confident of its being a Montanistic production. Mr. Vokes would agree as to its artificial character. It is a compilation the purpose of which perhaps will never be known. Was not the late Dr. F. C. Burkitt near the mark when he suggested that it seemed to owe its origin to a desire to explain how Christian customs arose,* and, may we add, sometimes to supply a fanciful explanation? Dr. J. A. Robinson's words are worth remembering in this connection: "Where was there ever a Church which celebrated the Eucharist after the manner here enjoined? Where was there ever a Church which refused to allow the Apostles more than a two days' stay?"†

We should like to conclude by saying that all students of Christian origins should read carefully Mr. Vokes' volume, which has certainly again, and with great clearness, performed the needful task of demonstrating that the Didache is not a document upon which to build theories concerning the growth of the ministry or of the development of eucharistic rites. An index would be a useful addition to the useful volume.

R. D. Middleton.‡

The Teaching of Religion. A Book of Suggestions for the Modern Teacher. By E. F. Braley. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

In the present state of religious education there is great need of a policy not conceived exclusively in the terms of the Church school. Canon Braley's attempt to cover the ground common to all teachers in elementary schools is, therefore, most welcome. He has written to help teachers to study and teach the Bible in school, and so far as the suggestions commend to a wider public the lines already familiar in the dioceses, it is all to the good that past experience should be widely shared. But it cannot be said that any new approach is indicated. The Bible syllabus-outlines belong to the general family of diocesan and "agreed" syllabuses, except that the historical approach is minimized. The ground of historical approach is not really broken until the senior school is reached. The analogy of the

* *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xxxiii., p. 27.

† J. A. Robinson, *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*, 1920, p. 86.

‡ It is not quite correct to say that the present reviewer, in his very modest contribution to this subject (*J. T. S.*, vol. xxxvi., p. 259 *ff.*), drew from the numerical divisions of the Didache that it "must" have been written by a Jewish Christian. Attention was called to the use of such a *memoria technica* as one indication amongst others of a very probable Jewish origin. His words are as follows: "Our author may have sprung from some such Jewish community and on his conversion composed this curious little work."

general historical approach in other subjects would suggest that this needs reconsideration. Nor is it a small matter that even the Senior syllabus contains no ordered account of the Life and Ministry of our Lord. Christianity is an historical and dogmatic religion. The syllabus-maker's hardest task is to decide at what stage these two great streams of history and dogma shall make their appearance. It is a pity, too, that the author could not find room for guidance in school worship, since it is becoming apparent to many, and not only in the elementary schools, that worship provides the scaffolding from which the teacher builds the religious character, and that apart from worship religious instruction may be irrelevant.

The author speaks hardly of our Church school policy. It is charged with " indoctrinating " the children, and an uninformed reader would be led to suppose that the child-victims of this system are taught the Christological sections of the Athanasian Creed, which is, of course, absurd and without foundation. No less astonishing is the assertion that " the best teachers—the most spiritually-minded teachers—usually prefer the Council school to the Church school." The reason alleged for this *obiter dictum*, which would cause equal hilarity in the staff-room of either school, is that " it is impossible to indoctrinate children at an early age."

Canon Braley has two constructive suggestions for future Church policy. The first is " to focus on the provision of Christian teachers for all schools." With the desire none would quarrel, but desire carries us no further. For effectiveness there would be required a State mandate, of which there are no signs, and Christian provision for the training of all teachers, rather than the cold-shoulder of " concentration " with which the State has in the last decade greeted attempts to extend denominational influence in the Training Colleges. Secondly, the author would like to see the Church maintain a few " demonstration " schools which would " demonstrate the possibilities of an education conducted on truly Christian principles." Whether our friends in the Council schools would regard such a " truly Christian " school as a compliment or a Mecca may well be doubted. But in fact " show " schools are not made in this way. It takes a quart of milk to throw up a gill of cream, and " show " schools emerge out of a system and not by calculated design.

Sir Frederick Mander, in a Preface, deplores the past with its " mists of theological wrangling and dogmatic assertion." The religion which parents " expect " is " a broad and human religious teaching which aims at producing ' a way of living and looking on life and meeting the situations of life.' " And

to this all the educationists of all the Christian Churches will say "Amen," if only Sir Frederick and the great Union of Teachers for whom he speaks will go on to assure us that by "life" they understand Life Eternal in Christ, beginning here and now.

J. R. Lumb.

NOTICES

Modern Man and Religion. By T. G. Masaryk. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

The late Professor Masaryk was a distinguished Professor of Philosophy, Ethics and Sociology, and in a bigger country would probably have remained a Professor to the end. But a great man in a small nation has to play many parts, and the war made Masaryk the leader and awakener of the Czech nation and after the war he became the first President of Czechoslovakia.

This book is the fruit both of his academic studies and his practical knowledge of affairs. He starts with the fact of what he calls *suicidism*, for suicide seems to be much commoner on the Continent than here. He attributes it to the despair of what he calls "wearied souls." It is not poverty or the hardships of living, but sheer pessimism. "Is there a God? We do not know. Is there a life after death? We do not know. Is there any purpose in life? We do not know. Why am I living? We do not know. Am I really living? Do I really exist? We do not know. What, then, do we know? Is it possible to know anything at all? We do not know. And this systematic 'We do not know' is called science, and people clap their hands above their heads and cry exultingly: 'The progress of the human mind is incomprehensible.'" Again he says: "Scientific and philosophic intellectualism . . . drives one to despair. The modern educated man chases happiness but catches death. His only hope lies in a return to religion." The author finds hope in the fact that the most modern philosophy and science are not antagonistic to religion, in contrast to some years ago, when, he tells us, in educated circles religion was considered to be dead without hope of resurrection.

His purpose in the book before us is first of all to give sketches of the systems of Hume, Kant, Comte, Herbert Spencer, and the Czech philosopher Smetana. He shews how each of them, while professing agnosticism, was forced to fall back on more or less religious conceptions. He then deals with literature and analyses the chief ideas which are found in the works of Musset, Byron, Goethe, Mickiewicz, Krasinski, Dostoevski and Tolstoy, who have expressed the religious longings of modern man. He finds common to all these authors a feature which he calls *Titanism*, or the cult of the superman.

The book is brilliant and suggestive and will repay study. It is perhaps a little inconclusive. We are not given any clear definition of what the author means by religion. He is successful in shewing the difficulties and shifts to which thinkers who reject religion have recourse, but that is, perhaps, all he sets out to do. As far as it goes and within its own limits, it is a brilliant and useful book. C. P. S. Clarke.

Our Debt to Spain. By E. Allison Peers. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.

Professor Allison Peers, who possibly knows Spain as well as any Englishman today, is hopeful of her future. He speaks with conviction and understanding of her piety and devotion—the religious history that she has made and the saints and mystics she can boast; but one is a little doubtful whether he has altogether faced up to the darker side of her religious life. That a ruthless monarchical despotism in the past has sown the seeds of many a modern disturbance can scarcely be more doubted than that the Inquisition did much to bleed Spain white of her true religious genius. His verdict that no dictatorship is needed to restore to Spain the Faith of her fathers may well be true—nor does Professor Peers think that any State will rob her of what she so truly believes to be her own.

Ashley Sampson.

Symbolism and Belief. By Edwyn Bevan. Allen and Unwin. 15s.

The Gifford Lectures of Dr. Edwyn Bevan are not concerned with symbolism in worship but with symbolical ideas. It is impossible within a short space to give any adequate idea of the range and depth of his researches. The belief that the visible symbols that our senses experience correspond with some invisible reality goes back at any rate to Plato; and Dr. Bevan here tests our conception of such experiences and their possible relation to the Unknown. He admits the necessity of anthropomorphic conceptions of Deity, and puts them to the test of logic and experience. The lectures which will probably cause the most widespread interest are those which deal with fact and value, Pragmatism and Truth; but the early chapters on scientific method are perhaps the most constructive. This notice is all too short, but we understand that the Editor will comment on the book next month.

Ashley Sampson.

The Church in the Ancient World. By L. E. Elliott-Binns, D.D. The Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d.

This is an excellent sketch of the pre-Nicene Church. It does not profess to give, even in outline, a complete history of the Church during this period, but to bring out its challenge to the pagan world which it confronted.

It is very well done and Dr. Elliott-Binns contrives to include a surprising amount of information in a very small space. The book is interesting and readable. The author is, perhaps, no doubt unintentionally, a thought patronizing to the early Christian martyrs. No doubt some of them suffered from an excess of zeal, which the Church shewed itself conscious of and ready to check, but if, like us, they had suffered from a defect of this essential quality rather than an excess, what would have happened to Christianity ?

Dr. Elliott-Binns is of course entitled to hold any theory of the Christian ministry to which the evidence seems to him to point. He is not entitled to assume the truth of his own theory as self-evident, and not even to suggest the existence of other theories. " In the first place

a college of presbyters must have needed a chairman, to use a modern term; though it is by no means to be taken for granted that the same individual would always act in that capacity. The presbyters might very well have taken it in turns. Hort has even suggested that the title 'bishop' represented at first not an office but a function and that any presbyter might act as bishop when occasion demanded. It was not a permanent position."

This is, of course, a tenable theory of the ministry. But Bishop Gore and now Dr. N. P. Williams have produced rebutting evidence to shew that the bishop received his powers by delegation from above rather than by elevation from his peers.

However, apart from these points we have for the book nothing but praise.

C. P. S. Clarke.

A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships. By Allan Barr, M.A. T. and T. Clark. 4s.

Professor Barr's chart folds into a slim cover, 7 inches by 10, and is clearly printed in four colours. Intelligently used, it provides a complete guide to synoptic questions. It is based on the Greek text, but readers of the R.V. can use it with advantage. One can distinguish the relative length of the three Gospels, Marcan matter, omissions of Marcan matter, adherence to or deviation from Marcan order—and all such matters familiar to the synoptic student. A brief survey of the synoptic problem is also provided.

It is evident that the chart is calculated to be of great help to the student. The only fear is that its possessor, having so much of the work done for him, will not fare so well in the end as the student who has marked his own Greek Testament for himself.

W. J. Ferrar.

The Development of Religious Toleration in England, 1640-1660. By W. K. Jordan, Ph.D. George Allen and Unwin. 21s.

Dr. Jordan is suspicious of over-simplification. There is, however, little danger of losing one's way in these pages, in which he deals with the years which saw the rise of that variety of belief and practice which in the end left toleration as the one practical solution. The arrangement of the material is methodical and the treatment thorough.

The book is in four sections, of which the first two are historical. For these the author draws largely on the records of parliamentary debates. They cover the period of the Presbyterian dominance and the succeeding period (1648-1660), when power shifted to the Independents. That the Presbyterians were as intolerant as ever Rome or Canterbury had been is a commonplace; Dr. Jordan shews that it was with less reason, since their Calvinism precluded the hope that persecution might be the means of saving the ungodly, as it did any fear that the godly might take harm. They persecuted, under Old Testament warrant, to avenge God's slighted honour. But it is easier to claim liberty than to give it. Later on Independency, to Cromwell's concern, shewed unmistakable signs of intolerance; nor could Cromwell allow a place for popery or prelacy.

Nevertheless, Anglican services were fairly widely held and, after 1650, private Anglican services were permitted. Roman Catholics were on the whole humanely treated and a consistently tolerant attitude was maintained towards the Jews already resident here.

The second half of the book deals exhaustively with Puritan and sectarian thought, which at times went so far as to advocate the complete separation of Church and State. If one wonders whether it is necessary to give such detailed accounts of these writers, there is no denying that the effect is to impress the principal lines of thought very clearly. Baptist thought—the English Baptists were in touch with Holland, where the economic advantages of toleration were realized—is fully discussed, and Dr. Jordan shews that in England, at this period, economic considerations weighed very little.

Dr. Jordan still fails to see that episcopacy had never been a thing indifferent to Anglicanism. But the book is a worthy successor to his two previous volumes, and the fourth and concluding volume, which will bring the story down to 1689, will be awaited with interest. Harvard University, in making the author's researches possible, has done a service to our times. For unhappily the subject is not now one of academic interest only.

F. E. Barker.

The Fundamentals of the Religious State. By Shirley C. Hughson, O.H.C. S.P.C.K. 6s.

S.P.C.K. has rendered further service to the Church in reprinting a standard work on the religious life by an Anglican author. Fr. Hughson, of the American Order of the Holy Cross, here surveys the whole principles of community life with great breadth and clarity. He distinguishes the essential from the accidental features of the life, shewing it to be a state of perfection which consists in following our Lord in poverty, chastity and obedience. The term means a state tending towards perfection, but never of course reaching its goal in this life on earth. All Christians, however, are called to perfection, and consequently, as St. Thomas is quoted as saying, perfection does not refer to the Counsels (of poverty, chastity and obedience), but to the perfect manner of observing the precepts of God. The Counsels are only instruments to that end, though in past times their value as such has often been exaggerated to the detriment of the life of the Christian in the world. From this exaggeration Fr. Hughson is perhaps not wholly free.

Nor is the book free from exaggerations on other points. All Anglican religious vows, we are told, are, or ought to be, solemn (and presumably unable to be dispensed), because they were such in the primitive Church. This is certainly contrary to fact, and no serious account is taken of later developments in the Western Church, though most Anglican communities are based on these. Obedience again is primarily obedience to the Rule of the Community, yet blind obedience to the superior in everything, short of disobedience to conscience, is advocated. There is also a note of austerity, which seems hardly human, in dealing with poverty and chastity. As a religious remarked after reading the book: "Well, it is not really as bad as all that!"

On the other hand there are admirable things said, such as the recognition of the obligation of leaving a monastery or convent for a time to support a parent, in view of our Lord's teaching about Corban. And the

counsels given to a superior are such as, if observed, would save many a community from disaster.

It is hardly a book to put in the hands of one aspiring to the religious life, except where his enthusiasm requires chastening. But it may well be read by novices and still more by professed brethren of longer standing, who need recalling to the fundamental principles of their vocation.

EDWARD SYMONDS, C.R.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY. By the Most Reverend Alban Goodier, S.J., Archbishop of Hierapolis. 7s. 6d.

THE AUGUSTINIANS FROM ST. AUGUSTINE TO THE UNION, 1256. By the Very Reverend E. A. Foran, O.S.A. Together with the life of St. Augustine by his contemporary, St. Possidius, newly translated into English. 7s. 6d.

A SICILEAN BORROMEO, THE SERVANT OF GOD JOSEPH BENEDICT DUSMET, O.S.B., ARCHBISHOP OF CATANEA AND CARDINAL OF THE HOLY ROMAN CHURCH. 1818-1894. By a Benedictine of Stanbrook Abbey. 7s. 6d. All published by Burns Oates and Washbourne.

All the three books represent Roman Catholic devotion. The first and most important is from the pen of the well-known Jesuit Archbishop Goodier. It is full of valuable guidance on the development of the natural man into the spiritual. Very interesting is the way in which the distinctive qualities of various religious orders are summarized. Thus, " if we look for the reason why the rule of Saint Benedict prevailed over all its contemporaries and predecessors, and has remained the background of all monastic life to the present day, we have to put it down to its sheer genuine and simple human appeal." " What peace is to the Benedictine, that happiness is to the Cistercian." " The Cistercian lives always in community, and is seldom alone: and the Carthusian, except in his church, and when obedience has ordered a modification of the Rule, is always alone, and seldom meets his brethren."

The second book on our list, entitled *The Augustinians*, opens with a long-wanted translation of the life of St. Augustine of Hippo, written by Possidius for the use of St. Ambrose. This is very welcome. The remainder of the book is not very convincing, because inadequately critical, endeavouring to trace St. Augustine's Rule through the following centuries up to the Union of 1256.

The last in our list is a life of the nineteenth-century Benedictine Archbishop Dusmet, Cardinal of the Roman Church. It is an interesting record of very devoted life, highly valued by Pius IX. and Leo XIII. There is a special reason for a biography at the present time, as his beatification is being promoted in Rome. The author is careful to add that " Supernatural facts related in this volume as witnessing to the sanctity of servants of God other than those canonized or beatified by the Church, rest on human authority alone, and in regard thereto, as in all things also, the writer submits herself without reserve to the infallible judgement of the Apostolic See."

W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON.

DID CHRIST REALLY LIVE? By H. G. WOOD. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

Is Dr. Wood flogging a dead horse? We have here a careful examination and complete refutation of the two main theories of J. M. Robertson, and writers like Drews, W. B. Smith and Rylands. These theories were that the Gospel account of the crucifixion was drawn from a mystery-play preserving the remnants of a human sacrificial rite, and that the Jesus of Christianity is really a pre-Christian Jewish God—the Joshua of the Old Testament. Dr. Wood's work is clearly and persuasively done, and he adds useful chapters on Rationalist prejudices, on the historicity of Jesus, in which the claims of "symbolism" as taught by Lowes Dickinson and Bousset are examined, and on the evidence for the "Jewishness" of the historic Christ given by Montefiore and other Jewish scholars.

These latter chapters shew that the horse flogged by Dr. Wood is by no means dead, even though the cruder forms of the Christ-myth theory no longer appeal to the educated. His book will be of great value, moreover, to those who have to deal with half-educated secularists, who are really keen on getting at the truth. The pity of it is, that at present a useful book like this has to be published at 5s., in competition with the cheap republications of the Rationalist Press. I seem to remember good pre-War apologetics going out from Paternoster Row at the price of 6d.

There is something tragic in the fact that the right medicine does not trickle down the right throats.

W. J. FERRAR.

SUNDAY MORNING: THE NEW WAY. Edited by Brother Edward, Priest Evangelist. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This book consists of a series of papers, almost all by parish priests, dealing with the practical problems and the results of trying to put into effect the ideals of the larger and more theological work *The Parish Communion*. In most cases this means, of course, the Sung Mass at 9.15 or 9.30, followed by a corporate breakfast. The parishes concerned are of all types—industrial, suburban and rural; English, Welsh, Scottish, Australian, South African and Indian; and at least one is of the "Evangelical" rather than the "Catholic" type. Any priest who is thinking of making the 9.15 venture will undoubtedly benefit by the experience of the priests who have contributed to this book, but, if both they and their people are to understand the significance of what they are doing, it is very important that the small size and low price of this book should not lead them to think that they can afford to neglect its more expensive and more theological predecessor.

E. L. MASCALL.

BOOK NOTES

The English Bible. Essays by various writers. Methuen. 3s. 6d. The publishers have conceived the admirable idea of reissuing essays by J. L. Lowes, W. MacNeile Dixon, A. Clutton-Brock, and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. From different points of view the literary supremacy of the Authorized Version is emphasized. The Bishop of Durham contributes an Introductory Essay.

A Philosophy of Work. By Etienne Borne and François Henry. Sheed and Ward. 6s. Once more we are indebted to the publishers for a very fine book, based on intimate knowledge of the modern situation and on sound Catholic theology. The argument is too full to be summarized. Suffice it to say that this is a book to be bought and read frequently. The generous spirit in which the authors try to find good in Marxism is especially to be noted.

The Greatest Drama ever Staged. By Dorothy Sayers. Hodder and Stoughton. 6d. The brilliance of this defence of orthodoxy can hardly be expressed in too strong terms. Some of the sentences deserve to become classical. But the special value of the pamphlet is that it is written by the creator of Lord Peter Wimsey: readers will listen to her who turn a deaf ear to preachers.

W. K. L. C.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher